A LITERARY ANALYSIS

OF

GENESIS 12-36

by

RNEST
NORMAN E. WAGNER

A Thesis Submitted in Conformity with the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the University of Toronto

1965

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

PROGRAM OF THE SENATE ORAL EXAMINATION

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

OF

NORMAN ERNEST WAGNER

2:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 9th, 1965

Room #201, 65 St. George Street

A LITERARY ANALYSIS OF GENESIS 12-36

Committee in Charge:

Professor H. E. Bowman, Chairman
Professor F. V. Winnett
Professor S. J. De Vries
Professor W. S. McCullough
Professor J. W. Wevers
Professor J. Macpherson
Professor R. K. Arnold
Professor E. Birnbaum

THESIS

"A LITERARY ANALYSIS OF GENESIS 12-36"

(Summary)

The aim of the thesis is to throw new light on the literary history of the Pentateuch by subjecting one part of it to intensive examination. The part selected was the stories of the three Hebrew patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in Genesis 12-36.

Part I presents a survey of recent trends in Pentateuchal criticism, special attention being given to (a) the attempts of Gunkel, Smend, Eissfeldt, Simpson *et al*. to subdivide the J material into two or more strands; (b) the doubts cast by Volz and Rudolph on the existence of an E document, (c) von Rad's division of P into two strands, (d) form-criticism, (e) Cassuto's attack on the documentary hypothesis, (f) Engnell's rejection of the methods of literary criticism and stress on the role of oral tradition. The survey reveals the existence of widespread dissatisfaction with the documentary theory as formulated by Wellhausen. The presence of different strata in the Pentateuch is recognized but none of the attempts to define the limits of these strata when considered as documents has carried conviction. It is suggested that the principal reason for the failure of literary criticism to reach a satisfactory solution of the problem lies less in its methodology - which differs in no essential respect from that used in studying other literatures - but primarily in the uncritical acceptance of the idea that there are two early, more or less parallel, documents, J and E, running throughout the Pentateuch. The result has been a tendency to make the evidence fit this pre-conceived theory.

The method followed in the dissertation was to take the first two chapters of the Abraham story (Genesis 12-13) and subject them to careful examination with a view to discovering if more than one point of view is represented and, if so, whether the different points of view are accompanied by differences in vocabulary and style. A tentative hypothesis regarding the literary structure of the two chapters was then formulated and this hypothesis tested as further chapters were examined.

Part II comprises a chapter-by-chapter analysis of the Abraham Story (Genesis 11:26-25:18). The analysis confirms the view that the material generally assigned to J is composite in character. But whereas previous critics have tended to regard the strands as having once formed independent documents, the present analysis leads to the conclusion that a considerable amount of the so-called J material is much later than J, is supplementary in character, and drawn for the most part from oral sources. Since the view here presented concerning the nature and date of this secondary material differs so radically from the views which have become associated with the term "J2," it has been deemed advisable to employ a new symbol. The selection of the symbol "C" has been influenced by the finding of some evidence that the author of this secondary material was none other than the Compiler of the Book of Genesis in its pre-P form.

The primary, or basic, J story of Abraham as recovered by the analysis does not present a complete biography of the patriarch. It begins with his "call" in ch. 12 and ends with the legend of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in ch. 19. The incompleteness and strongly religious character of the story suggests that it may have been designed for cultic use. The suggestion is advanced that this cultic document originated at Hebron during the first part of David's reign (*ca*. 1000 B.C.) when the Hebron sanctuary, of which Abraham was the reputed founder, served as the

royal sanctuary of Judah.

The J story has received an E supplement in the form of brief extracts. This material is found in chs. 20-22, more precisely 20:1-17; 21:2, 6-32; 22:1-13, 19. The fact that it was appended to the J story in the form of a supplement suggests that the latter was already in written form. Two of the E stories are pale reflections of stories found in J and were manifestly designed to rectify the unfavorable impression of Abraham conveyed by the J account. Both the subject-matter and the Negeb setting suggest that the E source was of Judaean and not of Israelite provenance as ordinarily assumed. The raising of the problem of indiscriminate punishment in 20:4 suggests further that E should be dated to the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel rather than about 750 B.C., or earlier, as is usually done.

The Abraham Story received a much greater augmentation at the hands of C. C attempted to present a full-fledged life of the patriarch by adding material which seems to have been drawn from oral tradition. If any of his additions, such as ch. 14, was derived from a written source it has been so recast that it is not possible to recover its original form. C takes up the theme of the divine promises to the patriarch - a subject touched upon only lightly by J - and develops it at some length, relating no fewer than four such promises (12:2-3; 13:14-17; 15:1-21; 22:17-18). C is strongly pro-Jerusalem and pro-Judaean in his sympathies. He brings Abraham into close touch with the Jerusalem sanctuary, has him recognize in its god El-elyon none other than YHWH and also has him set an example to his descendants by paying a tithe to its high priest (ch. 14). The setting of the solemn covenant ceremony described in the following chapter has its setting, by implication, outside the walls of Jerusalem.

The detailed analysis of the Jacob story (Genesis 25:19-36:43) carried out in Part III reveals that it is composed of three strands: J, C and P. No trace of an E supplement, like that encountered in the Abraham story, was found, nor any evidence of E elements within the body of the story. It was found possible to account for the occasional occurrence of the divine name Elohim without resorting to a theory of E authorship. The basic story (by a J author) differs from the J Abraham story in being much more biographical in character and much less religious in tone. It was probably designed to preserve a memory of Israel's origins. No evidence of date was found except that its main outlines seem to have been known to the eighth century prophet Hosea (12:3-5, EV 12:2-4). Since the Abraham story is clearly of Judaean origin and the Jacob story of Israelite origin, it is suggested that their authors should be represented by the symbols Ja and Jj respectively. It is of interest that Ja never uses the divine name Elohim.

Evidence was found that the Isaac story (ch. 26) is an addition by C. C makes Isaac the recipient of two divine promises and Jacob of one. These, with the four given to Abraham, make a total of seven, the perfect number. C's pro-Judaean bias may be seen in the fact that he gives six of the seven promises to the southern figures, Abraham and Isaac, and only one to the Israelite hero, Jacob. The same bias is to be seen in the stories in ch. 34-35 which seem designed to bring Reuben, Simeon and Levi into disrepute, leaving Judah with the undisputed right to leadership.

In Part IV the results of the investigation are summarized. One of the most noteworthy findings is that a considerable amount of the material usually assigned to J must be attributed to a late Judaean author (labelled "C") whose religious concepts show affinities with those of Deutero-Isaiah (6th century B.C.) and later authors. He also shows some traces of Deuteronomic influence and shares some vocabulary with P. A number of his characteristic expressions are found in the so-called J material in Genesis 1-11, material which de Catanzaro has given reasons for dating somewhere between the reign of Josiah (639-609 B.C.) and the Persian conquest of Babylon in 539 B.C. This raises the possibility that C and the late J author of the pre-P material in Genesis 1-11 are one and the same person - in other words, that C was the author of the Book of Genesis.

C's work received further supplementation at the hands of P (*ca.* 400 B.C.). Apart from chs. 17 and 23, his additions are largely chronological and genealogical in character. The P material gives the impression of being priestly commentary on the received text rather than a connected document.

The literary history of the Patriarchal Narratives in Genesis 12-36 may be summarized as follows: the original nucleus consisted of two documents: Ja, a cultic document of Judaean, probably Hebronite origin, dealing with Abraham, and Jj, a secular document of Israelite origin dealing with Jacob. These two documents were eventually brought together, possibly during the time of the United Kingdom. Later still the combined Abraham-Jacob story received extensive supplementation at the hands of E, C and P. The theory here presented differs from previous theories in that it attempts to demonstrate that the supplementation took place at three distinct times, and probably under official auspices, instead of being the work of many redactors and glossators extending over several centuries.

BIOGRAPHY

1935 -	Born, Edenwold, Saskatchewan
1958 -	B.A., University of Saskatchewan
1959 - 1960	Teaching Fellow, Near Eastern Studies, University College, University of Toronto
1960 -	M.A., University of Toronto
1962 -	Assistant Professor of Near Eastern Studies, Waterloo University College, Waterloo Lutheran University, Waterloo, Ontario.

GRADUATE STUDIES

Major Subject:

Hebrew Language and Literature	Professor F. V. Winnett
	the late Professor W. E. Staples
	Professor W. S. McCullough
	Professor J. W. Wevers
	Professor R. J. Williams

Minor Subjects:

Aramaic Language and Literature	Professor W. S. McCullough
German	Professor R. K. Arnold

PUBLICATIONS

"*Rinnah* in the Psalter," *Vetus Testamentum*, X (1960), pp. 435-441.

The Genesis Accounts of Creation, by Claus Westermann, translated by N.E. Wagner,
Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

Book reviews in The Canadian Journal of Theology, VI (1960), pp. 59-60; X (1964),
pp. 281-283.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my thanks to the members of the Department of Near Eastern Studies in the University of Toronto for their assistance in preparing this thesis. Professors W. S. McCullough and J. W. Wevers read the entire dissertation in preliminary form and offered numerous suggestions for its improvement. No amount of thanks can adequately express the debt I owe to Professor F. V. Winnett, who directed my research. He expended vast amounts of energy and devoted countless hours to the evaluation and refinement of the material here presented.

Mrs. D. M. Armbruster is also in my debt for the competent manner in which this thesis was produced.

My wife and family have been more patient and understanding than I could have imagined. The years with the Patriarchs will long be remembered.

Norman E. Wagner

Waterloo, Ontario
April, 1965

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AJSL	*The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*.
ATD	*Das Alte Testament Deutsch*.
BA	*The Biblical Archaeologist*.
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*.
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*.
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*.
BKAT	*Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament*.
BWANT	*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament*.
BZAW	*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.
CBQ	*The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*.
ET	*The Expository Times*.
ETI	C. A. Simpson, *The Early Traditions of Israel*.
FRLANT	*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*.
GK	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, trans. A. E. Cowley.
GTTOT	J. Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*.
HS	O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse*.
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*.
IB	*The Interpreter's Bible*.
ICC	*The International Critical Commentary*.
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*.
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*.
JBR	*Journal of Bible and Religion*.
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*.
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*.
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS--Continued

KB	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*.
RB	*Revue Biblique*.
SBU	*Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*.
TR	*Theologische Rundschau*.
ÜP	M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*.
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*.
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS iv

PART I RECENT TRENDS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

Chapter

I ATTEMPTED REFINEMENTS OF THE DOCUMENTARY THEORY 1

II ATTACKS ON THE DOCUMENTARY THEORY 12

III SUMMARY AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS 20

PART II THE STORY OF ABRAHAM

I GENESIS 12-13 27

II GENESIS 16 42

III GENESIS 17 51

IV GENESIS 18 56

V GENESIS 19 62

VI GENESIS 20-22 72

VII GENESIS 14 85

VIII GENESIS 15 93

IX GENESIS 23 103

X GENESIS 24 105

XI GENESIS 25:1-18 112

XII THE LITERARY DEVELOPMENT OF THE ABRAHAM STORY 117

EXCURSUS A SUMMARY OF C. J. DE CATANZARO, "A LITERARY ANALYSIS OF GENESIS I-IX" 131

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Page

PART III THE STORY OF JACOB

Chapter

I GENESIS 25:19-34 144

II GENESIS 26 149

III GENESIS 27 156

IV GENESIS 28 165

V GENESIS 29 169

VI GENESIS 30 175

VII GENESIS 31 183

VIII GENESIS 32 191

IX GENESIS 33 196

X GENESIS 34 200

XI GENESIS 35 204

XII GENESIS 36 210

XIII THE LITERARY DEVELOPMENT OF THE JACOB STORY 215

PART IV

THE LITERARY GROWTH OF THE PATRIARCHAL TRADITIONS (GENESIS 12-36) 223

APPENDIX A THE J NARRATIVE 228

APPENDIX B EXPRESSIONS CHARACTERISTIC OF C 245

APPENDIX C EXPRESSIONS CHARACTERISTIC OF P 246

APPENDIX D SYNOPSIS OF PREVIOUS CRITICISM 247

BIBLIOGRAPHY 254

PART I RECENT TRENDS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM

I ATTEMPTED REFINEMENTS OF THE DOCUMENTARY THEORY

For almost one hundred years there has been general agreement among critics that the Pentateuch is not a simple literary unit but a compound of four separate and distinct documents, J, E, D and P. It is claimed that these documents were progressively combined by three editors or redactors known respectively as R^{JE}, R^{D} and R^{P}, each of whom added necessary connecting links and supplementary comments. Although there is no absolute unanimity among critics regarding the date of the documents, it is customary to date J *ca.* 850 B.C., E *ca.* 750 B.C., D *ca.* 650 B.C., and P *ca.* 450 B.C. These general conclusions were elaborated by Karl Heinrich Graf (1866), and Abraham Kuenen (1869 *et seq.*), but the Documentary Theory was presented in its most convincing form by Julius Wellhausen in 1876 *et seq.*, and has come to be known as the Wellhausen Theory.[1] Since its inception, this theory has dominated the interpretation of the Pentateuch, and has exerted a profound influence on other branches of Old Testament scholarship as well. While many critics feel that the theory offers a more satisfactory explanation of many of the problems which the Old Testament presents than any other scheme yet proposed, it is generally recognized on all sides today that the Wellhausen Theory is not entirely satisfactory. Many attempts at improving the details have been made, but none of the suggested improvements or alternatives has commanded general acceptance. The literary composition of the Pentateuch remains one of the greatest unsolved problems in Biblical Studies.

In recent years there has been a pronounced shift away from a purely literary or documentary approach. Critics have employed a variety of methods with varying degrees of success. A great deal has been done and still needs to be done by means of Form-Critical and

Traditio-Historical methods. Some of the critics using these newer methods have assumed at least some permanent gains on the part of literary criticism and have put forth their theories as elaborations of the conclusions arrived at by earlier scholars. It would seem to be desirable, therefore, to re-examine both the role and the techniques of the classical literary approach with a view to determining whether or not the foundations on which subsequent theories have been constructed are adequate to the task. Since the present study will concentrate only on the literary problem, it is clear that the suggested solutions may be expected to provide a basis for subsequent study of the pre-literary history of the material or its possible cultic basis, but such matters themselves will not be given more than cursory attention. In this sense, the present study will not be an attempt to arrive at a full answer to the problems involved. Furthermore, it will be limited to the first book of the Pentateuch, Genesis, with special attention given to chs. 12-36. It is hoped that the analysis of a sizable block of material will throw new light on the literary history of the whole. Limiting the investigation to these chapters scarcely requires defence. The differences in content and approach between the patriarchal stories and both the Primeval History (Gen. 1-11) and the Joseph Story (Gen. 37-50) are striking.[2] The relationship between the various parts of Genesis will be discussed more fully below. Before undertaking such a re-examination, it will be helpful to review the major attempts at revising the Wellhausen Hypothesis.

Since it has been indicated that literary problems are the primary concern of this study, it is not necessary to attempt a complete sketch of the history of Pentateuchal Criticism. Rather, the chief developments within literary criticism itself will be noted.

1. Attempts to subdivide J.

One of the first attempts to improve the Wellhausen Theory was the suggestion that the J document is not a unity but is composed of two or more strands. Although he did not work out the details, Wellhausen himself recognized the composite character of J (e.g., he felt that in Gen. 1-11 there was a strand in JE which had no knowledge of Noah and the Flood, comprising chs. 2, 3, 4:16-24, 11:1-9).[3] The first critic to demonstrate the possibility that the J material in Gen. 1-11 is composed of two separate documents was Karl Budde.[4] His J^1 and J^2 documents were held to be similar in many respects, although occasionally one contains an episode not known to the other. They were eventually woven together by an editor whom Budde called J^3 and whose activity he described in the following words: "Der Verfasser von J^3 ist zwar nur ein Redactor in etwas vergrössertem Massstabe, aber hie und da erhebt auch er sich zu dem Range eines Schriftstellers."[5]

A survey of Genesis-I Kings was undertaken by C. Bruston, resulting in the conclusion that two J strands can be detected in the material investigated.[6] Unfortunately, Bruston's work attracted little attention.

Hermann Gunkel also recognized that J was composite but employed the symbols J^e and J^j rather than J^1 and J^2 in the Primeval History (Gen. 1-11), and J^a and J^b in the chapters dealing with Abraham.[7] He believed that the J material dealing with Abraham came from two originally separate collections of traditions. According to J^a Abraham's home was located at Hebron, while in J^b his home was placed in the Negeb around Beersheba. It is in these two centres that the two circles of traditions arose.[8] Gunkel viewed J as a collection of traditions which conform more or less to a common point of view. He felt that there was no such thing as a single J author. To attempt a description of the personality of the Yahwist (the author-collector of J) as Bernard Luther did in his "Die Persönlichkeit des Jahwisten"[9] would be to Gunkel an exercise foredoomed to failure.

Rudolph Smend reverted to the use of the symbols J^1 and J^2 and extended the separation of the J material to include the entire Hexateuch.[10] He expressed concern, however, that documentary analysis was becoming so minute, with bits and pieces of individual verses being assigned to several sources, redactors, editors and glossators that critics were losing sight of the underlying unity of the Hexateuch. He suggested that this unity could be preserved if it was assumed that J^1 and J^2 were not isolated from one another in their development but that

J^2 was dependent on J^1; later on the two sources were combined by an editor. "J^2 schrieb freilich in Abhängigkeit von J^1, und E in Abhängigkeit von J, indessen wollte J^2 den J^1, und E die Kompilation J ersetzen. Gleichwohl wurde J^2 mit J^1 kompiliert, und E mit J."[11] Smend's chief contribution was to suggest a developmental theory for the sources which would do away with the necessity of numerous "hands" who merely combined existing documents of independent origin, showing little or no originality.

The suggestion that J had undergone a gradual development had been suggested briefly by Meyer and Luther, who summed up their view as follows: "Was bedeutet J^1 und J^2? Quelle von J oder (ältere oder jüngere) Schicht in J? Natürlich das letztere."[12] In other words, the view that J^2 either supplemented or at least made use of J^1 was once more advanced.

Another critic advocating revision of a J^1 document by a second J writer was J. Meinhold, who stated that while it is proper to speak of J^1 and J^2, "Vielmehr wird wohl eine Bearbeitung des stark heidnisch klingenden Berichtes von J^1 durch spätere Federn anzunehmen sein."[13]

In opposition to the theory that there was dependence on some previous document on the part of a later writer, Otto Eissfeldt returned to the theory of originally separate documents, combined by editors at a later date. As a further refinement, Eissfeldt introduced a new symbol known as L, and summarized his view of the literary structure of the Hexateuch in the following manner:

> Es stellt die Abkürzung von Laienquelle oder Laienschrift oder Laienkodex dar, und die Wahl dieses Siglums und dieser Quellen Bezeichnung erklärt sich folgendermassen: Unser Buch will zeigen, dass der Hexateuch, genauer: seine erzählenden Teile, aus vier in sich geschlossenen, alle einstmals selbständig existierenden, Erzählungswerken komponiert ist.[14]

Eissfeldt attempted to show that the material in his L source is chiefly of a lay character and reflects an anti-priestly point of view. The matter of interest at the moment is that he rejected the idea of any interdependence of sources.

The theory more recently proposed by C. A. Simpson[15] is more complex but may be summarized as follows: He dates an early J source to David's time and suggests that it may have originated in or near Hebron. At the end of the tenth century, or in the early part of the ninth, J^2 expanded and interpreted J^1 in the light of some Northern traditions. The result, to be called J, was then supplemented by various hands. Following this, E made a further revision of J, again from the Northern point of view, by adding additional stories current in the North, but different from those used by J^2. E's work was also expanded by various writers. Subsequently, R^{JE} attempted to create a unified picture. Simpson believes that "the work of R^{JE} was more complex than has usually been supposed."[16] Simpson thus returns to the view of Smend in suggesting that one document or source might be based, at least to some extent, on a preceding source. He differs radically from Smend, however, in regard to the activity of glossators and redactors in that he finds numerous bits and pieces coming from various hands.

The picture has been further complicated by the suggestions of Pfeiffer,[17] and Morgenstern,[18] that additional early sources need to be considered. These views have not attained any appreciable following, nor has the ingenious theory advocated by Lewy, that J is made up of a nucleus drawn from a source which he calls N, and attributes to Nathan the prophet, and a series of annotations made by J^P, a priestly reviser.[19]

As a result of the modifications noted thus far, it is no longer possible to speak only of a J source without further definition. A major aim of the present study is to re-examine the attempts to subdivide J, and to study the relationship between the component parts.

2. The extent and character of E.

The extent and character of the E source is another subject of continuing dispute. It is generally agreed that most of the material in Genesis 20-22 comes from E, but there are some who believe that E material is to be found in ch. 15.[20] Mowinckel originally assigned to E much of the material in chs. 1-11 which is often attributed to J^2, but has subsequently denied the independence of E as a separate source.[21]

The idea that E is composite in character was advanced by Kuenen who spoke of an E^1 source, which he believed originated in the Northern

Kingdom some time in the eighth century B.C., and of an E^2 source which was a seventh century Southern revision.[22] Among the followers of this view were Cornill[23] and Procksch.[24]

With regard to the relationship of E to J, Procksch held an extreme position, maintaining E's absolute independence of J. Indeed, he felt justified in writing a full length book, Das Nordhebräische Sagenbuch: Die Elohimquelle,[25] devoted to an examination of this separate chronicle. His view has been challenged, however, by several critics.[26]

At the other extreme stands the work of Volz and Rudolph. Early in his part of their joint work, Volz sums up his own view as follows:

> Was ich mit der folgenden Abhandlung bezwecke, ist die Darlegung und die Erweisung der Überzeugung, dass wir in der Genesis nur einen einzigen Erzähler vor uns haben (den wir den Jahwisten nennen wollen), dass vor allem der sog. Elohist kein selbständiger Erzähler war, dass der sog. Elohist, wenn er überhaupt existierte, höchstens Neuherausgeber des grossen (jahwistischen) Erzählungswerkes war, dass in das grosse ursprüngliche (jahwistische) Erzählungswerk (sei es von einem sog. Elohisten, sei es von einem deuteronomistischen Redaktor) einzelne Abschnitte aus bestimmten Erwägungen heraus eingefügt wurden.[27]

Since the material covered by Volz falls entirely within the scope of this study, his views will receive detailed consideration below. It may be noted, however, that Volz, like Simpson, does not play down the need for redactors and glossators, as might be expected in view of his theory of supplementation. Rudolph, working independently of Volz, examined the Joseph Story and then worked through to the end of the Pentateuch.[28] He was not prepared to do away with E entirely, but suggested that it should be viewed as a later expansion of J.[29]

3. The P material.

There has been little disagreement in regard to the limits of P since Th. Nöldeke's Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments,[30] although the chronological order of the various sources has been reversed in the interim. As far as the relationship of P to the other sources is concerned, it has generally been accepted as an established fact that P is the framework into which an editor fitted the existing JED complex.[31] However, there have been those who suggest that P might have been added to the other material. Max Löhr, for instance, maintained that P represents a series of later additions and modifications made by Ezra and his associates in an attempt to create a harmonious and unified product. This theory is not unlike the view of Volz regarding E, noted above. Löhr denied that P ever existed as an independent document.[32]

Gerhard von Rad has attempted yet another approach to the P material.[33] He feels that parallel strands are discernible within the P material. The common source for the two strands is a "Toledothbuch", that is, the detailed genealogical lists found in the present P source. During a long period of development, two narratives, which he calls "A" and "B", came into existence. "A" was primarily interested in history, while "B" placed more emphasis on the cult. In actual fact, however, the two were so similar that they were readily merged into one document. To what extent this theory is supported or disproved by the P material in chs. 12-36 will be examined below.

Since a study of P would require a thorough analysis of the levitical legislative sections of the Old Testament, and since these fall outside the limits of the present study, only general conclusions regarding the extent and nature of P will be attempted. Studies such as the above mentioned book by Lewy cannot be fully examined since the bulk of the evidence adduced is drawn from outside Genesis. Any material usually attributed to P and falling within the material under investigation will, however, be evaluated.

4. Summary.

It is clear from the above, necessarily brief, survey of present trends in the literary analysis of the Pentateuch that great diversity of opinion still exists with regard to the nature of the sources J, E and P and their relationship to one another. On one point, however, most critics are agreed, namely, the composite character of J. These scholars favor a theory of two strands (J^1 and J^2, or J^e and J^h, or J and L), but the relationship of the second strand to the first is disputed. Some regard the second strand as an independent development, others regard it as dependent on the first.[34] In any case, it is clear that it is no longer sufficient to speak of "J" without further qualification, and that to speak of the "style of J" or the "theology of J," as many scholars still do,[35] is to beg the question. On the other hand, the suggestions that E and P should be subdivided have met with a cool reception.

Apart from the tendency to note the composite nature of J, there has been some evidence on the part of those who adhere to the Documentary Theory to stress the developmental or supplemental aspect of the material, and to view the literature as growing in a more plausible manner than was formerly assumed. Not only Löhr and Volz, but the majority of those listed above, favor a gradual expansion of, or at least reliance upon, older material. It will become clear below that critics could have made much more of this insight, but in actual fact they often carried out their analysis as if such a theory were untenable. Yet, it is quite unfair to tar all literary critics with the same brush and to lump them all together as believers in a mechanical joining of parallel documents, a theory of composition often referred to sarcastically as the "scissors-and-paste" method.

NOTES ON CHAPTER I

[1] J. Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments (Berlin: Reimer, 1899).

[2] Cf. the comments by B. D. Napier, From Faith to Faith (New York: Harper & Bros., 1955), pp. 71 and 97. Compare also J. Hempel, Die althebräische Literatur und ihr hellenistisch-jüdisches Nachleben (Wildpark-Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1930), pp. 112 ff. R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York and London: Harper & Bros., 1941), p. 141, suggested that J begins in Genesis 12.

[3] Die Composition, p. 8; cf. also pp. 207-208.

[4] Karl Budde, Die Biblische Urgeschichte (Gen. 1-12, 5) (Giessen: Ricker, 1883).

[5] Ibid., p. 460.

[6] C. Bruston, "Les deux Jéhovistes," Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, XVIII (1885), pp. 5-34, 499-528, 602-637.

[7] H. Gunkel, Genesis, Part I, Vol. 1 of Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, ed. W. Nowack (5th ed. rev.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922). Gunkel's name is associated primarily with the application of the form-critical method to the Book of Genesis. It is often forgotten that he was also a thorough-going literary critic as well. It was only after he was satisfied that the literary material had been adequately analyzed that he was prepared to delve into the preliterary history. Note the table on p. civ of Genesis, where he used seven kinds of type to denote the different sources, redactional comments and glosses.

[8] Gunkel's theory was adopted in the main by J. Skinner, Genesis, ICC (2nd ed. rev.; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1930), although he used J^h and J^b in place of J^a and J^b to emphasize their origin at Hebron and Beersheba respectively; see e.g., p. 240.

[9] E. Meyer-B. Luther, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme (Halle: Niemeyer, 1906), pp. 105-173.

[10] R. Smend, Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht (Berlin: Reimer, 1912).

[11] Ibid., pp. 342-343.

[12] Meyer-Luther, Die Israeliten, p. 156. Underlying the division of J into two strands was the theory that J^1 had no record of a journey to Sinai, recording only the events of a trip from The Sea directly to Kadesh; see p. 67.

[13] J. Meinhold, "Die jahvistischen Berichte in Gen 12-50," *ZAW*, XXXIX (1921), pp. 42-57.

[14] O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922), pp. ix-x.

[15] C. A. Simpson, *The Early Traditions of Israel* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1948).

[16] *ETI*, p. 36.

[17] R. H. Pfeiffer, "A Non-Israelite Source of the Book of Genesis," *ZAW*, XLVIII (1930), pp. 66-73.

[18] J. Morgenstern, "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch," *HUCA*, IV (1927), pp. 1-138.

[19] I. Lewy, *The Growth of the Pentateuch* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1955).

[20] See the analysis of ch. 15 below.

[21] S. Mowinckel, *The Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen 1-11* (Oslo: Dybwad, 1937); see now his *Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch*, *BZAW*, XC (1964).

[22] A. Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, trans. Philip H. Wicksteed (London: Macmillan, 1886), see pp. 248 ff.

[23] C. H. Cornill, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (2nd ed. rev.; Freiburg: Mohr, 1892).

[24] O. Procksch, *Die Genesis*, Vol. 1 of *Kommentar zum Alten Testament*, ed. E. Sellin (3rd ed. rev.; Leipzig: Deichert, 1924).

[25] (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906).

[26] P. Volz and W. Rudolph, *Der Elohist als Erzähler: Ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?* *BZAW*, LXIII (1933), p. 13. In this connection compare also S. Mowinckel, "Hat es ein israelitisches Nationalepos gegeben?" *ZAW*, LIII (1935), pp. 130-152.

[27] *Der Elohist als Erzähler*, p. 13.

[28] W. Rudolph, *Der 'Elohist' von Exodus bis Josua*, *BZAW*, LXVIII (1938).

[29] *Ibid.*, pp. 258 ff., and compare also S. Mowinckel, "Der Ursprung der Bil'amsage," *ZAW*, XLVIII (1930), pp. 233-271.

[30] (Kiel: Schwers'sche Buchhandlung, 1869).

[31] Cf. Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, pp. 2 ff.

[32] Max Löhr, *Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem: I. Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis*, *BZAW*, XXXVIII (1924).

[33] G. von Rad, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch literarisch untersucht und theologisch gewertet*, *BWANT*, Folge IV, Heft 13 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934).

[34] This is the basic point at issue in the debate between Eissfeldt and Simpson which can be followed in this sequence: Eissfeldt, *HS*; Simpson, *ETI*; Eissfeldt, *Die Ältesten Traditionen Israels*, *BZAW*, LXXI (1950); Simpson, *Composition of the Book of Judges* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957), esp. pp. 149-196; Eissfeldt, *Die Genesis der Genesis* (2nd ed. rev.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1961).

[35] N. K. Gottwald, *A Light to the Nations: An Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), pp. 218 ff.; George W. Anderson, *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: Duckworth, 1959), pp. 32 ff.

II. ATTACKS ON THE DOCUMENTARY THEORY

The theory that the Pentateuch is a compilation of several separately existing documents has not been accepted by all Biblical scholars. Unlike the advocates of Form-Criticism who make use of documentary analysis at some stage in their work, there are many who refuse to accept the basic tenets of literary or documentary criticism. In some cases the opposition appears to be inspired almost exclusively by theological conservatism[1] and is therefore outside the scope of this study. Others, concerned primarily with a study of the content of the material, regard documentary analysis as unimportant.[2] There have been a number of critics, however, who have not only attacked the purely literary approach, but have suggested some alternatives. Several of these scholars will be mentioned at this point for illustrative purposes. The list is by no means exhaustive.

B. D. Eerdmans, a pupil of Kuenen, made a clean break with the documentary theory in 1908.[3] He suggested that the presuppositions of Kuenen and Wellhausen were faulty, and that the key to the solution lay in recognizing that the so-called E material was an originally polytheistic source of considerable antiquity, and that the present Book of Genesis is the result of a number of revisions tending toward a monotheistic point of view.[4] The work of Eerdmans was subjected to a thorough analysis by Walter Eichrodt,[5] who defended the traditional literary approach.

A far more penetrating attack on the Documentary Theory was launched by Umberto Cassuto. A detailed and comprehensive study was published in 1934.[6] An abbreviated version of Cassuto's work appeared in Hebrew in 1941,[7] and was translated into English twenty years later.[8] According to Cassuto, the Documentary Hypothesis rests on five major pillars:

(i) the use of different names for the Deity;

(ii) variations in language and style;
(iii) contradictions and divergences;
(iv) duplications and repetitions;
(v) the composite nature of certain stories.

After subjecting each of these pillars to a minute examination, he came to the conclusion that the documentary theory had "nothing to support it and is founded on air."[9]

Cassuto was not the first to attack the validity of relying on different divine names as a criterion for the separation of the sources. Dahse, for example, had questioned this aspect of literary criticism by pointing to the variant readings in some Hebrew manuscripts and especially in the Septuagint.[10] His objections were answered by Skinner's convincing demonstration that the Massoretic Text is basically far more reliable than Dahse had supposed.[11] Cassuto, however, did not approach the problem from the same point of view as Dahse. He did not question the authenticity of the Hebrew text; rather he attempted to prove that YHWH is used "in all branches of Hebrew literature having a purely Israelite content--for example, the prophetic writings, the legal sections, and the poetic literature insofar as it has a national or folk character."[12] Elohim (or Eloah or El) is used in the wisdom literature and in poetry "whose subject matter is not exclusive to Israel but is of universal import."[13] Since the narratives in the Book of Genesis are in some measure related to the literature of other Near Eastern cultures and also of a strongly nationalistic character, it is not strange to find both YHWH and Elohim used. Attractive as this solution may sound, it fails to withstand close scrutiny. For example, the Garden of Eden story in Genesis 3 is clearly based on non-Israelite traditions, yet in it the divine name YHWH occurs. Cassuto attempted to account for the use of YHWH by saying, "Although some details of the story show a certain connection with non-Israelite traditions, these are but details; the heart of the narrative is its moral content, and it is this that decides the choice of the Divine Name."[14] Such reasoning is far from convincing. Cassuto's solution is even less convincing when he deals with the Flood Story, suggesting that YHWH is used when the moral motive is given special stress, and Elohim when it is not emphasized.[15] However, there is just as much moral emphasis in 6:9-13, which employs Elohim, as in any other section of the story. Cassuto's strictures on an uncritical use of the divine names as a criterion for identifying sources are not entirely unwarranted but he has clearly overstated the case by saying that this pillar is "the ultimate foundation of the documentary theory, not only historically but also theoretically."[16] Many critics have indeed applied the criterion in far too rigid a fashion with no allowance made for the possibility that a J writer may use Elohim in certain circumstances, such as when God reveals himself to a Gentile, or when an Israelite is outside Palestine. While he has issued a salutary warning, Cassuto has not demolished the "first pillar".

In attacking the second pillar, variations in language and style, Cassuto selected expressions such as ילד and הוליד , כרת ברית and הקים ברית , אנכי and אני , and attempted to show that they are not synonymous but variations due to the requirements of sense or syntax.[17] Cassuto's theory fails to account for the fact that in two genealogies generally assigned to J, viz. 4:17-18 and 22:20-24, ילד is used to express the idea of "begetting", while in similar P constructions, 11:27 and 25:19, הוליד is found. While it is clear that כרת ברית "to make a covenant", and הקים ברית "to carry out a covenant", need not be identical in meaning, it does appear as if one idiom is preferred in certain contexts, while the other is chosen elsewhere. Cassuto's comments regarding this "pillar" are a necessary warning, if not a convincing argument. Indiscriminate use of vocabulary alone in determining the authorship of a narrative is to be guarded against, yet a judicious use of such evidence is warranted, as will be shown in the analysis below.

To illustrate the weaknesses of the third pillar, contradictions and divergences of view, Cassuto attacked the assertion of some critics that in J God reveals himself in corporeal form, in E by means of dreams or visions at night or by angels during the day, while in P he reveals himself by means of speech alone.[18] Although denying the possibility of separate documents as a solution of the problem, Cassuto was forced to admit that different viewpoints are present. When he says that different traditions were incorporated into the Torah with no attempt at complete harmonization,[19] he is actually not far removed from the view of many literary critics.

As an example of the fourth pillar, duplications and repetitions, Cassuto takes the two Creation stories in Gen. 1-3, and the three accounts dealing with the wife-sister episode, 12:10-20; 20:1-18; 26:7-11. It is true that the differences between the two creation stories have been overstressed, but Cassuto's contention, "that there is no disparity between the two sections, and there is nothing to show that they were not connected at the time of their composition"[20] is an unconvincing alternative. With regard to the various accounts involving the wives of Abraham and Isaac, Cassuto's explanation is noteworthy:

> It is possible that all three flowed from one ancient saga, but this belongs to the pre-history of the subject and has no bearing on our problem. We are interested only in the fact that if the acceptance of the three stories harmonized with and promoted the Torah's aim, there was no reason to exclude them.[21]

If the word "Torah" were replaced by "editor", his conclusions would not be unlike those of many literary critics.

Cassuto endeavoured to demolish the fifth pillar, signs of composite structure, by exposing the absurdities inherent in the usual documentary analysis of Genesis 27. It is unfair, however, to infer that since the explanations offered by literary critics are unsatisfactory, no real problem exists.

While performing a service in drawing attention to weak spots in the traditional documentary approach, Cassuto's efforts are clearly anachronistic. Much of what he attempted to overthrow is no longer held to be inviolable.

The most violent attack on the Documentary Theory in the last two decades has come from the pen of Ivan Engnell of Uppsala. Although he wrote no commentary on Genesis or any other part of the Pentateuch, he ridiculed literary critics and their work, suggesting that a complete break with previous scholarship was essential if valid conclusions are to be obtained.[22] The views which he attacked are, however, those which were current fifty years ago, hence much of his scorn is outdated. The mechanical piecing together of documents is not suggested by any reputable scholar today as being the method by which Israel's literature evolved.[23] Nor are there many who adhere to Wellhausen's lineal evolutionary theory regarding the development of Israel's institutions, a point which Engnell attacked with considerable force.[24] It is generally accepted today that a source such as P, which may have been written in post-exilic times, contains much ancient material.[25]

One of Engnell's chief contentions was that insufficient attention had been paid to the laws established for the transmission of oral tradition.[26] This matter has received considerable attention from Biblical scholars, and must be studied further in the light of increasing evidence.[27] In fairness to Engnell it should be pointed out that he did not reject entirely the possibility of written transmission. He admitted that "oral tradition and transmission in writing should not be played off as mutually exclusive alternatives, but be considered as methods, running alongside and complementing each other."[28] Since he was willing to admit the possibility of some written transmission it is difficult to understand why he rejected literary criticism *in toto*.

In evaluating the traditions he asserted that three steps must be taken: first, the age of the tradition must be determined, then its *Sitz im Leben*, finally its tendency or bias.[29] This procedure appears to be sound, but surely Engnell left himself open to criticism because of his insistence that it is only in a cultic myth-ritual framework that the true meaning can be discovered. This would appear to be as subjective as the "historical" interpretation which he held to be illegitimate.

Regarding the formation of the Pentateuch, Engnell, following Noth, insisted that it is legitimate to speak only of a Tetrateuch (Genesis-Numbers) and a Deuteronomic work (Deuteronomy-Kings). These two blocks were originally separate from one another and, if traditional symbols were employed, they could be called a P work and a D work.[30] P was the final *tradent* of the Tetrateuch and was responsible for the unity it possesses, but like a good story teller, he did not change more than was absolutely necessary.[31]

In short, Engnell's criticism of the Documentary Theory hardly applies to the present situation. North's comment appears to be entirely justified, "Much of Uppsala's polemic against 'Wellhausenism' is directed against the Wellhausenism of fifty years ago, and there is a good deal of banging upon doors that are no longer obstinately closed."[32]

The emphasis on utilizing all available information from studies on archaeology, cultic practices, propagandistic tendencies, and so on, is certainly valid, but at least some of these have been taken into consideration in some measure since the time of Gunkel. The fact that oral transmission is a major element to be reckoned with is no longer denied, but overemphasizing its role will scarcely solve all of the problems inherent in the narratives, as Nielsen's study has demonstrated.[33] It can be said for the Traditio-Historical approach that it raises the possibility that far more of the Pentateuchal material was derived from oral sources than has ordinarily been supposed.

In general it may be said that the opponents of the Documentary Theory have provided needed reminders of the dangers involved in permitting literary analysis to become artificial and extreme. On the other hand, the alternatives which they propose cannot be regarded as entirely sufficient to solve the numerous problems which still remain.

NOTES ON CHAPTER II

[1] E.g., H. M. Wiener, *Pentateuchal Studies* (Oberlin: Bibliotheca Sacra, 1912); E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (2nd ed. rev.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960). This is also true of some Roman Catholic and Jewish critics, cf. J. Coppens, *Histoire Critique des livres de l'Ancien Testament* (3rd ed. rev.; Desclée, Bruges: de Brouwer, 1942) and M. H. Segal, "The Composition of the Pentateuch--A Fresh Examination," *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, ed. C. Rabin, VIII (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961), pp. 68-114.

[2] D. B. MacDonald, *The Hebrew Literary Genius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933). Cf. p. 96, "Behind the book there are, of course, the documents--E, J, P, and the rest--of our documentary analysts; we are not concerned with these."

[3] B. D. Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien* (4 vols.; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1908-1912).

[4] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 90.

[5] W. Eichrodt, *Die Quellen der Genesis von Neuem Untersucht*, *BZAW*, XXXI (1916).

[6] U. Cassuto, *La Questione della Genesi* (Florence, 1934).

[7] *תורה התעודות וסידורם של ספרי התורה* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1941).

[8] *The Documentary Hypothesis*, trans. I. Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961).

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[10] J. Dahse, *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1912).

[11] John Skinner, *The Divine Names in Genesis* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914).

[12] *The Documentary Hypothesis*, p. 27.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 44-47, p. 47, pp. 49 ff.

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 55 ff.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[22] His major works in this field are: I. Engnell, *Gamla Testamentet: En Traditionshistorisk Inledning I* (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells, 1945); a number of articles in *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, eds. I. Engnell and A. Fridrichsen (2 vols.; Gävle: Skolförlaget, 1948-1950); "Methodological Aspects of Old Testament Study," *VT*, Supp. VII (1960), pp. 13-30.

[23] Cf. "Literärkritik," *SBU*, p. 90.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 90. See also *Gamla Testamentet*, pp. 109-167.

[25] Cf. J. Pedersen's comment that all the sources are both pre-exilic and post-exilic, "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," *ZAW*, XLIX (1931), p. 179.

[26] Engnell's views are dependent on the work of H. S. Nyberg, *Studien zum Hoseabuche*, Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1935:6 (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells, 1935).

[27] See the recent survey by R. C. Culley, "An Approach to the Problem of Oral Tradition," *VT*, XIII (1963), pp. 113-125.

[28] *VT*, Supp. VII (1960), p. 23.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[30] *Gamla Testamentet*, p. 211.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

[32] C. R. North, "Pentateuchal Criticism," in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 71.

[33] E. Nielsen, *Oral Tradition*, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 11 (London: SCM Press, 1954).

III SUMMARY AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is evident from the above brief survey of Pentateuchal criticism during the past few decades that there has been persistent dissatisfaction with the Documentary Theory. That there are different strata of traditions, coming from various times and presenting different views, seems to be generally agreed, but the attempts to define the exact limits of these strata when regarded as documents have failed to carry conviction. While there is some justification for the attitude of despair toward the Documentary Theory as presented by Wellhausen, it is questionable whether the theory should be abandoned entirely. It is necessary, as Engnell has noted, to make allowance for the co-existence of both oral and written traditions. Perhaps the following comment, written some years ago, needs to be taken far more seriously by critics:

> Although we know that this view is contrary to the general opinion of Biblical scholars, we find it difficult to escape from the suspicion that the growth of the Hexateuch may have had something in common with that of the Mahābhārata. In both cases the nucleus consists of a story or stories, preserved first by oral tradition, and frequently showing variant accounts of incidents. . . . In both cases the stories received in course of time voluminous accretions of didactic matter, both moral didactic and antiquarian didactic--represented in the Hexateuch by D and P respectively.[1]

The concept of a nucleus which received elaboration is related to Martin Noth's theory of a Grundlage (G),[2] or Speiser's "T", which underlies both J and E.[3] Such a concept, envisaging the gradual growth of traditions, is supported by the fact that similar explanations have been attempted in connection with the Gilgamesh epic[4] and the Homeric poems.[5]

It is also possible that a later editor or writer has collected and arranged a variety of traditions, a view noted by S. H. Hooke as follows:

> I hold that Genesis is one book . . . written from many sources, not three, and these sources were in a form or language which had to be completely remodelled by the author of the book in order to make them intelligible. That being so, it is impossible to

> say whether there were in existence collections of stories for the author to use or not, though we may guess that it is very probable.[6]

This is not unlike the old "crystallization" hypothesis or the theory of August Klostermann, who suggested a series of expansions of an original Mosaic nucleus.[7] Elias Auerbach speaks of a major "Überarbeitung" of biblical material in a later period.[8] Similarly, Samuel Sandmel follows a related approach in a significant article entitled, "The Haggada within Scripture," in which he suggests that a process of gradual accretion and supplementation provides a more realistic answer to the growth of the literature.[9]

It should be recalled that in discussing the developments which have taken place within the framework of a literary approach to the Pentateuch, attention was drawn to the tendency to view the various strata or sources as in some measure supplementary to preceding material (see above, pp. 7-8).

While it may be true that literary criticism has not provided a full answer to the question of the origin and development of the material, the techniques of former critics need not be discarded as entirely useless on the grounds that the attempted solutions leave something to be desired. The five criteria employed by earlier critics (see pp. 12-13), most of which are valid for all literary criticism, are surely legitimate tests to apply when attempting to decide whether a document is a literary unity or of composite authorship. It is true that these tests need to be applied judiciously. Different writers may be expected to display differences in vocabulary and in point of view, especially if they are widely separated in time. It is surely justifiable also to regard the presence of contradictions and divergences, duplications and repetitions as evidence that a narrative is of diverse origin. It is to be expected that such evidence would point to a recognizable pattern which will provide a key to the literary history of the stories in question. The real question is whether they point to oral traditions of diverse origin or to written traditions of diverse origin. This is a matter which can only be decided when the material has been carefully examined.

If there is validity in a literary approach and if the various sources which are delineated are connected with one another in more than haphazard fashion it is essential that a careful study be made of the editors or redactors responsible for the eventual ordering of the material. It is an undeniable fact that since Hupfeld advanced the "New Documentary Theory" the efforts of the various hands involved in merging the documents have been minimized and in practice regarded with scorn. Wellhausen defended the use of the term "Jehovist", for example, to designate the individual responsible for combining J and E. The very choice of this term shows that as far as Wellhausen was concerned such an editor lacked originality and individuality since the name is composed of the consonants from the name YHWH and the vowels from Elohim.[10] In other words, the Jehovist was little more than a selector who made use of existing material, blending the traditions into some sort of conflate narrative which is now difficult but not impossible to disentangle. The Jehovist, or R^{JE} as he came to be called, derived his material almost exclusively from the sources with which he worked. Gunkel summed up his view and that of many other critics by stating of such a redactor, "Er selber tritt mit eigenen Worten in der Genesis sehr wenig hervor."[11] To the present time such a view is still held by some literary critics, with R^{JE} credited only with "a certain amount of revision and interpolation."[12] Critics seem to have resigned themselves to the activity of redactors as a necessary evil. If redactional activity is detected it is easily brushed aside as insignificant and termed "secondary".

Such a view seems to be out of keeping with studies of other parts of the Old Testament. Martin Noth has suggested that the Deuteronomic History is an actual literary production, but he denies that the Tetrateuch had a comparable "Verfasser".[13] This view is open to question. It can not be affirmed on a priori grounds that the Tetrateuch, or Genesis in particular, is not the work of a master editor. Engnell proposed just that when he recognized P as the last tradent in the formation of the Tetrateuchal narrative.[14] It is clear that such a possibility must be borne in mind with regard to the Book of Genesis. Curt Kuhl has shown that he is sensitive to such a view:

> Nowadays less and less attention is paid to the question of authenticity, which previously played a large part in Old Testament research. A new conception has arisen concerned with finding

> out what was the purpose behind these additions and with understanding the composition as such. Why did the redactor arrange the parts as we now find them--sometimes so unreconciled and so contradictory that the transitions and breaks are immediately recognizable? Was this really mere literary incompetence? Or is there a definite purpose behind it? We are touching here on a problem on which little work has been done but which may well put a better complexion on the activities of the redactors, previously such objects of derision. The individual books and collections have not only a prehistory but a post-history.[15]

A similar approach has been followed in New Testament studies as may be seen in Hans Conzelmann's The Theology of St. Luke.[16]

This means that a new kind of literary criticism must emerge which employs the traditionally acceptable criteria noted above, but which accepts the responsibility of going beyond these criteria in an attempt to discover the significance of the present order of the traditions. James Barr has cogently summed up the matter by stating, "A thorough literary criticism can never work with purely mechanical literary criteria, but must carry with it some kind of provisional judgment of the nature of the religious content."[17]

One of the chief aims of the present study is to investigate the activities of the so-called redactors responsible for the collecting and ordering of the traditions in the Book of Genesis.

The procedure which will be followed will be to take the first two chapters of the Abraham Story (Genesis 12-13) and subject them to careful examination with the object of discovering if more than one point of view is represented and, if so, whether the different points of view are accompanied by differences of vocabulary and style. An effort will also be made to discover if there is any evidence for the presence of two parallel strands and whether secondary material, if found, comes from one hand or from several. On the basis of the evidence encountered, a provisional hypothesis will be formulated and then this hypothesis tested as further chapters are examined. In evaluating the evidence in a literary study it must be admitted that the case is not always unambiguous and clear-cut. There is a cumulative effect which results from a broad survey which serves to determine whether or not the hypothesis is a "possible" solution to the problems which occasioned its formulation. The chief function of the working hypothesis is to direct the investigation in the search for order among the facts which are encountered.[18]

In this thesis special attention has been paid to the works of Gunkel, Procksch, Eissfeldt and Simpson.[19] This does not imply that other critics have not been consulted. The above mentioned scholars are the most articulate representatives of the "classical" literary approach in recent years and their thorough studies have raised most of the problems concerning the literary composition of Genesis which require re-examination. For the convenience of the reader, their conclusions are tabulated in Appendix D which may be consulted to obtain a summary of previous attempts to describe the growth of the literature comprising the Patriarchal Stories in the Book of Genesis.

NOTES ON CHAPTER III

[1] H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature*, II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), p. 751.

[2] M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948), pp. 40 ff.

[3] E. A. Speiser, *Genesis. Translated with an introduction and notes* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1964), p. xxxviii.

[4] R. de Vaux, "A propos du second centenaire d'Astruc--réflexions sur l'état actuel de la critique du Pentateuque," *VT*, Supp. I (1953), p. 186.

[5] E.g., A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960); Hugh Lloyd-Jones, "Versions of Homer," *New Statesman*, LXIV (Dec. 7, 1962), pp. 836-837.

[6] S. H. Hooke, *In the Beginning*, Old Testament Vol. VI of the Clarendon Bible (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947), p. vii.

[7] A. Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1907).

[8] E. Auerbach, "Die grosse Überarbeitung der biblischen Bücher," *VT*, Supp. I (1953), pp. 1-10.

[9] *JBL*, LXXX (1961), pp. 105-122.

[10] J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 16.

[11] *Genesis*, p. xcii.

[12] S. H. Hooke, "Introduction to the Pentateuch," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, eds. Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (London: Nelson, 1962), p. 169.

[13] *ÜP*, p. 2.

[14] *Gamla Testamentet*, p. 214.

[15] Curt Kuhl, *The Old Testament: Its Origins and Composition*, trans. by C. T. M. Herriott (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961), p. 299.

[16] Trans. by G. Buswell (London: Faber & Faber, 1960).

[17] "Tradition and Expectation in Ancient Israel," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, X (1957), p. 28.

[18] Cf. Morris R. Cohen and Ernest Nagel, *An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1934), p. 201.

[19] Gunkel, Genesis; Procksch, Die Genesis; Eissfeldt, HS; Simpson, ETI.

PART II THE STORY OF ABRAHAM

I GENESIS 12-13

Preface: Abraham's Ancestry (Gen. 11:26-32).

Although this passage lies outside the formal limits of this thesis, it cannot be ignored since it furnishes information for a fuller understanding of the Abraham Story,[1] serving as an introduction to the account which follows.

Verses 26 and 27 are obviously an essential segment of the genealogy of the sons of Shem in 11:10 ff., vs. 27 being an integral part of the toledoth scheme (see 6:9; 10:1, 32; 11:10; etc.). The same can be said for vs. 32 which forms the conclusion to the genealogy. There is general agreement among critics that these three verses are the work of P (see App. D).

The remaining verses, 28-31, do not follow the rigid pattern of the rest of the genealogy, but provide bits of incidental information which serve to illumine the subsequent narrative. Verses 28-31 appear to form a closely connected sequence, each verse advancing the story in some detail. The stage is prepared by having Terah, along with Abraham and Lot, depart from Ur Kasdim. Arriving at Haran, they settle down (vs. 31). This move from lower Mesopotamia to Aram Naharaim seems straightforward enough, but the expression ללכת ארצה כנען in vs. 31 poses a problem. It seems inconsistent with the statement made later in the same verse that they "settled" (וישבו) at Haran, since this clearly implies more than a brief halt. For this reason, and since the expression ארץ כנען is held to be a mark of P, it is customary to assign vs. 31 to P. An objection to this is that according to P's chronology Terah continued to live at Haran for sixty years after the departure of his son Abraham for Canaan (see 11:26, 32; 15:5).[2] If P had attributed to Terah an intention from the very beginning of going to the land of Canaan, it is strange that he does not explain why Terah did not carry out such a plan. It is probable, therefore, that this verse is not part of the P material. The use of the expression ארץ כנען is not necessarily a proof of P authorship, since it is difficult to suggest another term which a writer could have used in its place. Writers other than P must surely have made use of this expression.

With vss. 26-27 and 32 attributed to P, the remaining material, vss. 28-31, may be assigned to a hand earlier than P, i.e. J, to use the conventional symbols of previous critics.[3] The occurrence of the expression אור כשדים in this J material is worthy of special attention. Most critics feel the expression is a gloss.[4] But if the reference in vs. 28 is original it points to a rather late date for the material in question, since, apart from Gen. 15:7, the expression is not used elsewhere in the Old Testament prior to the work of the Chronicler, and even *Kasdim* is not mentioned before the arrival of Nebuchadrezzar in Palestine (see II Kings 24:2).[5]

12:1-8. Abraham's migration to Canaan.

Called by YHWH, Abraham left his home and, together with his household and nephew Lot, journeyed to an unknown land where a new life began. The manner in which Abraham is introduced in vs. 1 provides a fitting beginning to a vividly written story.

Verses 2-3 contain YHWH's promise that he will make Abraham into a great nation, and that all the families of the earth will recognize his greatness. It is generally assumed that vss. 2-3 form a continuation of vs. 1 and provide one of the dominant themes for J's story of the Patriarchs, and with similar passages elsewhere in Genesis (e.g., 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14), recount the idea that Israel will be a blessing to all mankind.[6] A more likely interpretation, however, is that the nations will use the name of Abraham to invoke blessings either on themselves or on one another. The only other examples in the Old Testament of ברך in the Niph'al and Hithpa'el make this interpretation virtually certain. Thus in Deut. 29:18 a true worshipper of YHWH is instructed to invoke a blessing upon himself, while in Isa. 65:16 instruction is given to bless oneself by the true God. A closer parallel to the idea in vss. 2-3 is to be found in Psalm 72:17 where the nations are said to invoke blessings on themselves in the name of a king and in Jer. 4:2 where the nations are to bless themselves by YHWH.

Simpson drew attention to the fact that a promise is made to Abraham in vs. 7 which he considers part of the primary narrative. This led him to regard vss. 2-3 as secondary.[7] It may also be pointed out that these verses can be detached from the narrative without marring the flow of the story. The command issued to Abraham in vs. 1 is carried out in vs. 4, "Go . . . and he went." It should be noted too that vss. 2-3 are more verbose than vss. 1 and 4 which narrate the events with dramatic brevity.

While the above considerations are not sufficient in themselves to warrant a final verdict on the matter, they do cast doubts on the originality of these verses as part of the primary story. Following a study of related promises elsewhere in Genesis (18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14), it may be possible to come to a more definite decision.

Simpson suggests that vs. 3b is "unnecessary" after 2b; hence he calls it a gloss, as he does the almost identical passage in 28:14b.[8] There is, however, no need to fragmentize vs. 3. Verse 3b is not a mere repetition of either vs. 2 or vs. 3a; it adds a new dimension. Eissfeldt's attempt to detect parts of his two major strands, assigning vss. 1, 2 and 4a to L, and vs. 3 to J,[9] also fails to recognize the unity of vss. 2 and 3.

There is general agreement among critics that vss. 4b-5 are the work of P. The reasons given are: (i) the chronological interest; (ii) the reference to Haran, as in 11:32; (iii) the use of the following expressions: רכוש and the verb רכש , נפש in the sense of "person", עשה meaning "to acquire" and ארץ כנען; (iv) the repetition of שנה with each numeral (a sign of late date according to Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, sec. 134 h.); (v) the statement that Abraham took Lot with him (vs. 5) is redundant after vs. 4a.

These reasons are not of equal value. The reference to Haran in vs. 4 is certainly not a sign of P, for the term has already been met in 11:31 above, which was shown to be from a source other than P. Similarly, the expression ארץ כנען was also encountered in 11:31. The use of רכש will be discussed below in connection with ch. 14. Despite these observations, the remaining evidence is sufficient to warrant attributing most of vss. 4b-5 to P. Since the expression בארץ is found in vs. 6, it is possible that a reference to "the land" preceded. Procksch suggested that the last three words in vs. 5 be assigned to J (see App. D). If this suggestion is followed, a smooth narrative results. It should be noted that it is possible to delete vss. 4b-5 without marring the flow of the basic narrative.

By retaining a reference to Ur Kasdim in 11:28 for P, von Rad points to the mention of Haran in 12:5, also P, as evidence for his theory of two strands in P. His solution is to assign the Ur reference to PA, with the PB strand responsible for Abraham coming from Haran.[10] If the analysis of 11:28-32 proposed above is accurate, there is no support for von Rad's theory.[11]

Gunkel regarded the words עד אלון מורה in vs. 6 as an explanatory gloss on the preceding words עד מקום שכם . On the other hand, Simpson feels that the reference to the מקום "sanctuary" in vs. 6 is premature since the founding of the sanctuary is not mentioned until vs. 7. It is more probable that in the present context מקום has the meaning of "site" rather than "sanctuary", a translation which scarcely needs documentation.[12] There may even be the implicit suggestion that the town of Shechem had not yet come into existence. In any case, there are no adequate grounds for regarding either phrase as a gloss. The first expression indicates the general area to which Abraham had come, the second specifies the exact spot. Therefore, vs. 6a may be regarded as part of the primary narrative and not as a later expansion.

Most critics take the words והכנעני אז בארץ (vs. 6b) as a gloss, although Gunkel felt that the mention of "the land" prepared the way for the promise of the land in vs. 7.[13] Nielsen takes the expression to mean that the Canaanites were still in the land. He believes that the narrator inserted these words to clear Abraham of any suspicion of connection with Canaanite culture, especially divination at sacred trees, a practice which was repudiated at a later date.[14] Such an explanation seems improbable, since אז is not used to express continuation but regularly designates a point of time in the past. Further comment on the passage will be deferred until 13:7 is considered below.

Verse 8, which relates the construction of an altar by Abraham at a spot between Bethel and Ai, is regarded by most critics as part of the primary narrative. It poses a problem, however, in that elsewhere the patriarchs build altars at well known sites, whereas here Abraham builds an altar at a nameless spot. Furthermore, there is no evidence that this particular location ever served subsequently as the site of a sanctuary. The problem, therefore, is to explain the rise of the tradition recorded in vs. 8.

The region between Bethel and Ai is associated in Hebrew tradition with two events: (1) the separation between Abraham and Lot (see 13:3-4) and, (ii) the capture of Ai by the Hebrews under Joshua (see Joshua 8, especially vss. 9 ff.). The first-named association scarcely provides sufficient basis for the rise of a tradition that Abraham erected an altar in this area, especially since it was erected before the separation took place. Nor does the association with the capture of Ai explain its rise. While Abraham's movements seem to anticipate and foreshadow the experiences of his descendants, as will be noted below, the similarities between the account in Joshua 8 and the present verse are not of such a character as to suggest that Abraham's activity in this area foreshadows the Israelite capture of Ai. Any supposed parallelism breaks down when it is recalled that the capture of Ai took place after the sojourn in Egypt, whereas in 12:8 Abraham has not yet gone to Egypt.

It may be that vs. 8 is an attempt to harmonize two conflicting traditions, one of which attributed the founding of the Bethel sanctuary to Abraham, the other to Jacob (see ch. 28). If so, the verse constitutes a modification of the original Abraham tradition and may well be the work of a hand later than J. There may be some significance in the fact that Abraham is said to have not only built an altar east of Bethel, he "called by the name of YHWH", an expression which Skinner suggested denotes "the essential act of worship, the invocation (or rather evocation) of the Deity by the solemn utterance of His name."[15] No such act is attributed to him at Shechem, where he merely builds an altar (see vs. 7). It is possible that no contrast is implied; the writer may be making explicit for one site what is implied for the other. Nevertheless, the verse seems to represent an attempt to "correct" an earlier tradition and presumably derives from a secondary hand. Again, it is to be noted that the verse may be deleted without marring the narrative. The extent of the primary narrative here and elsewhere may be seen in Appendix A. For a further suggestion regarding the possible significance of the verse, see the discussion of 19:17-23 below.

Gunkel and Simpson take the expressions מקדם לבית־אל and בית־אל מים והעי מקדם to be doublets. Gunkel assumed that the former was a gloss, while Simpson believes that the second is a comment intended to define the location more precisely. It is more likely that this is an example of reinforcement through repetition, not a mark of composite literary structure. Thus there is no good reason to question the unity of the verse.

Vss. 9-20. Abraham and Sarah in Egypt.

Most critics feel that vs. 9 is a redactional link, and that the rest of the chapter which relates Abraham's sojourn in Egypt either is from a separate J source or is a secondary addition. Wellhausen had suggested that this Egyptian episode breaks the natural connection between 12:8 and 13:2 and is therefore a later expansion.[16] Gunkel picked up the suggestion and assigned the section to his Jb source, while vss. 1-8 were assigned to Ja. Simpson attributes vss. 10-20 to J2 (see App. D). Dillmann suggested that the story was part of the J narrative but misplaced.[17] Procksch, who felt that any material found in both J and E is to be attributed to a basic J source which he calls J*, followed this approach here as well (see App. D). The arguments advanced for assigning vss. 1-8 and 10-20 to different sources are as follows: (i) Abraham's journey seems to have been originally depicted as "continuously southward, from Shechem to Bethel . . . and thence to his permanent abode in Hebron."[18] A journey to Egypt can be fitted into this pattern only with difficulty. (ii) According to the present form of the narrative, Abraham visited the spot between Bethel and Ai on two occasions, once before going down to Egypt (12:8) and once after leaving Egypt (13:3). Nowhere else is Abraham represented as paying two visits to the same spot. If 12:9-20 comes from a separate source, with 13:1, 3-4 regarded as redactional links, the original narrative will have Abraham visit the Bethel area only once.[19] (iii) Chapters 20 and 26 relate an episode similar to that in 12:10-20, and many critics feel that ch. 26 presents the oldest version.[20] (iv) Lot appears in the first part of ch. 12 and once more in ch. 13, but is not mentioned in 12:10-20. (v) Abraham's home is in the Negeb, not at Hebron as elsewhere; see 13:18; 18:1.[21]

Argument (i) is purely subjective in character, being based on an *a priori* view of the course of Abraham's movements and as such carries little weight. Argument (ii) appears to be more impressive, but is immediately undermined if, as has been suggested above, 12:8 is secondary. The full force of argument (iii) can be assessed only after a study of chs. 20 and 26. Argument (iv), dealing with the absence of Lot in 12:10-20, is not germane since this section of the narrative offers no occasion to mention him. It would surely have been superfluous for the author to have referred to Lot as a mere spectator. As soon as Lot is to play a role in the narrative, he is re-introduced (see 13:1).[22] Argument (v) is not really relevant since it is not even stated that Abraham lived in the Negeb; he merely passed through it (see also 13:1-2).

There is actually a strong argument for regarding 12:9-20 as integrally related to the basic narrative found in 12:1, 4a, 5b*, 6-7 and the primary account in ch. 13. The story of the Egyptian sojourn alone explains how it was that Abraham and Lot, on leaving Egypt, were rich in flocks and herds, silver and gold (see 13:2, 5 and 12:16). Therefore, to assign 12:10-20 to a different source from that of the preceding and following narratives would be to omit an essential link in the story.[23] In addition, there is some validity in the suggestion put forward by B. Luther,[24] which was worked out more fully by Cassuto,[25] that Abraham's journey seems to be portrayed as a prototype of the experiences of his descendants. After a temporary stay in Canaan, a famine forces Abraham and his family to flee to Egypt, where they come to the attention of Pharaoh. After YHWH has plagued the Egyptians (note that נגע in 12:17 is the word found also in the Exodus Story), Abraham and his household depart with abundant riches. They return to the promised land where Abraham and Lot decide to go their separate ways. There is no more than similarity between this episode and the exodus and conquest traditions, and the details cannot be forced, but if the observation is at all relevant, there would be further reason for considering vss. 9-20 as part of the basic story.

Dillmann, Gunkel and most other critics regard the words ועבדים ושפחת in 12:16 as secondary, since a reference to human slaves interrupts a list of animal possessions (see App. D). The order is strange but a similar pattern is encountered in 24:35, צאן ובקר וכסף וזהב ועבדם ושפחת וגמלים וחמרים, and in 30:43 צאן רבות ושפחות ועבדים וגמלים וחמרים. Apparently the writer considered slaves and animals in much the same category. There is no need to suspect the presence of a gloss. A later scribe might, in fact, be expected to employ a more natural grouping, listing the slaves first and then the animals.

Most critics also regard ואת־ביתו in vs. 17 as a later expansion (see App. D), but such a view is open to the same criticism as that regarding the position of the reference to male and female slaves mentioned directly above.

It is thus possible to attribute vss. 9-20 in their entirety to the writer responsible for the primary narrative in chs. 12-13.

13:1-5. Abraham and his family return to Canaan.

Some commentators feel that vs. 1 is redactional, linking the Egyptian story with the account of the separation of Abraham and Lot. Others regard vs. 1 as the conclusion to the story in 12:10-20. Most are agreed that vs. 2 belongs to the basic source (see App. D). If 12:9-20 is part of the primary narrative, as has been suggested above, vs. 1, which forms the natural sequel, would also stem from the same source, with vs. 2 continuing the account.

Virtually all critics agree that vss. 3-4 break the natural connection between vss. 2 and 5 and should therefore be assigned to a redactor (see App. D). It is obvious that they refer back to 12:8 and this suggests that they are either the work of the same, or a later, writer. It should be noted that the expressions אהלה and קרא בשם יהוה occur in both passages.[26] It is clear that the primary account is continued in vs. 5.

Vss. 6-13. Abraham and Lot separate.

There is general agreement that vs. 6 is from the hand of P because of the following expressions characteristic of P elsewhere: (i) the noun רכוש ; (ii) the specialized sense of נשא (see App. C); (iii) also, its similarity to 36:7, which is also assigned to P. The verse does seem to break the connection between vss. 5 and 7, which are obviously part of the primary narrative; hence the assignment to P is justified.

Most critics regard vs. 7b as a later gloss, just as they regard the nearly identical expression in 12:6b as a gloss (see App. D). Gunkel's observation, which was noted above (see p. 30), makes it probable that 12:6b is part of the basic story. It is possible that 13:7b is also part of the original story. In Judges 1:4-5 the expression "Canaanites and Perizzites" seems to denote the pre-Israelite inhabitants of Canaan, and may reflect an early tradition. Perhaps the inclusion of Perizzites in 13:7 compared with the mention of Canaanites alone in 12:6 was intended to suggest that the Perizzites had arrived in Palestine during Abraham's journey into Egypt.

Verses 8-10 clearly continue the primary narrative.

Since the time of Dillmann it has been generally agreed that vs. 10 is overloaded and that the words לפני שחת יהוה את־סדם ואת־עמרה constitute, in all probability, a later expansion. They come too soon in the story, since the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah is not related until ch. 19.[27] This clause may best be regarded as a later expansion by a writer familiar with the story of the destruction of the cities in ch. 19. Simpson regards כגן־יהוה and כארץ מצרים as doublets, and follows Gunkel in regarding the former as a gloss (see App. D). It is difficult to conceive of the expressions as doublets since they are by no means synonymous. Each expression, however, adds a new dimension. Simpson's suggestion that באכה צער is "a qualifying gloss on *Egypt*",[28] would seem to be strengthened by the reading of the Syriac Version ($\underline{S^{c}N}$). However, this reading may well rest on a confusion between *reš* and final *nun* in the Hebrew text. What the Massoretic Text says is that before the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the *kikkar* of the Jordan was well watered all the way to Zoar, being like the land of Egypt or the Garden of YHWH (Eden?). There is thus no good reason to dispute this reading especially since Zoar plays a significant role in ch. 19. To sum up, vs. 10b appears to be an elaboration of vs. 10a, but there are no grounds for insisting that vs. 10b is the work of more than one hand.

Most critics assign 11b-12ab[a] (הככר. . . ויפרדו) to P because of the use of the expressions ארץ כנען and ערי הככר (see App. D). It has been suggested above, however, in connection with 11:31 and 12:5 that it is unlikely the expression ארץ כנען was confined to P material. The statement in vs. 11 that "Lot chose for himself the whole kikkar of the Jordan" requires as a complement some mention of the territory which fell to Abraham as his portion. Verse 12a supplies this. Verse 12b ("Lot moved his tent as far as Sodom") is similarly balanced by the statement in vs. 18 that "Abraham moved his tent and came and dwelt at the terebinths of Mamre at Hebron." These verses seem to be necessary to round out the story. The assumption that the reference to the "cities of the kikkar" in vs. 12 is secondary since J knew only of the destruction of Sodom is questionable. The matter cannot be settled until 19:28 has been examined. No compelling reason has been found for denying any of vss. 11-13 to J.

Vss. 14-18. Abraham is promised the land and settles at Hebron.

These verses relate two promises which YHWH made to Abraham after the departure of Lot: (i) to give the land of Canaan to his descendants as an eternal possession; (ii) to make his descendants as numerous as the dust of the earth. Wellhausen noted that this section breaks the natural connection between vss. 12b[b], 13 and 18.[29] Gunkel labelled it "ein Zusatz",[30] Simpson discovers various hands,[31] Holzinger regarded it as the work of R^{JE}.[32] The manifest purpose of the insertion is to point out that Abraham received the land not by default since Lot chose the kikkar region, but because it was in accordance with YHWH's will.[33] One thing is clear: the conclusion of the story of the separation of Abraham and Lot would be both more natural and more effective if the respective movements of these two figures after their separation were narrated in close sequence, i.e. if vs. 18 followed closely upon vss.

12-13. This would strengthen the case for regarding vss. 14-17 as a secondary addition to the simpler narrative. Similar promises are found in: 15:5-20; 18:17-19; 22:17-18; 28:13-14, and these will be discussed at the appropriate place. Skinner believed that these promises "represent a later phase of religious reflection."[34]

A Provisional Working Hypothesis.

The above examination of chs. 12-13 has brought to light a number of aspects concerning their literary structure which may now be drawn together to form a working hypothesis which will be tested as the analysis proceeds.

(i) It has been possible to detect a primary narrative in these chapters, which can be read as a connected account (see App. A). Since the divine name YHWH is used throughout this account (see 12:1, 4, 7, 17; 13:13, 18), it is in order to designate the source by the symbol J. This is done without commitment to any of the current theories regarding the date and provenance of J.

(ii) The J narrative has been expanded at several points by P, viz.: 12:4b-5*; 13:6. This P material can be explained more naturally as comments on, or supplements to, an existing account than as a document which once enjoyed independent existence. Judgment on P in the present study applies only to the material in the patriarchal stories. The nature and origin of the P material in the extensive legal parts of Exodus to Numbers may be quite different. This theory regarding the nature of P will be tested as further chapters are examined.

(iii) After the P additions have been removed, further material remains which appears to be secondary. Thus 12:2-3 contains the idea that Abraham (symbolizing Israel) will be a blessing to mankind, or that Abraham will be so blessed that in future all peoples will employ his name in blessings. In either case, to judge from the rest of the Old Testament, ideas are here put forth which are elsewhere attested only in later material. If 12:8 and 13:3-4, which relate the founding of an altar by Abraham near Bethel, represent an attempt to reserve for Jacob the honour of founding the sanctuary at Bethel, they constitute a later modification of the tradition, and may be assigned to a hand later than J. The originality of 13:10b is suspect since it anticipates the story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah which is not related until ch. 19. If other instances are found in which J anticipates later parts of his narrative, this judgment on 13:10b will have to be revised. It was seen that 13:14-17 break the natural connection between vss. 12b-13 and 18 and, from a literary point of view, weaken the effectiveness of the ending of the story.

While it would be possible to regard these (assumed) secondary passages as the work of several annotators, there is no good reason to do so. There are obvious points of contact between 12:2-3 and 13:14-17, and between 12:8 and 13:3-4. The first two of these passages may be regarded as attempts to enlarge upon the divine promise made to Abraham in 12:7 by adding to the promise of the land the promise of numerous descendants and a glorious future for them. Comment has been made concerning a possible motivation for the addition of 12:8 and 13:3-4.

It is clear that the proposed analysis requires that the whole problem of redactors and glossators be re-examined. While it is not certain that all the non-P additions in chs. 12-13 should be assigned to a single writer, this does appear to be a reasonable possibility. Such a possibility will be carefully examined in the course of the analysis of subsequent chapters. The writer or writers responsible for this material consistently use(s) the divine name YHWH (12:8; 13:4, 10, 14), hence, following the practice of previous critics it may be argued that J2 would be an appropriate symbol to designate these additions. Since the term J2 has been used by several scholars in a sense quite different from that suggested by the present writer, it is felt that such a term would be misleading to a reader. Rather, the symbol X will be used here and in subsequent chapters to designate material which appears to be secondary to J, but which is not the work of P. Following a study of the entire Abraham Story an attempt will be made to determine whether one hand or several are involved.

As has been noted above (see p. 9), Pfeiffer and others have suggested that the primary source in Genesis (J) does not begin with 2:4b, but with ch. 12. This suggestion must be kept in mind since the analysis of chs. 12-13 has revealed that a J narrative is embedded in these chapters, a source which has been amplified first by a later writer(s) using the divine name YHWH and then by P. This hypothesis can only be regarded as tentative since the material examined thus far is very limited in extent. The validity of the theory will be tested as further sections of the Patriarchal Narratives are examined.

Since chs. 14 and 15 present problems of a particularly difficult character, it has been felt that as much evidence as possible ought to be assembled before undertaking their analysis. A study of these chapters will therefore be deferred until chs. 16-22 have been examined.

NOTES ON CHAPTER I

[1] For the sake of consistency and to avoid confusion, the names Abraham and Sarah will be used throughout. On the spellings Abram and Sarai, see the analysis of ch. 17.

[2] According to the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Terah died the year Abraham migrated to Canaan.

[3] The symbols J, E, P, etc., which critics have used in the past are used here provisionally. At the conclusion of this chapter further definition will be suggested.

[4] Cf. A. Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, p. 214; H. Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 157.

[5] Presently available extra-Biblical evidence regarding *Kasdim* may be seen in A. L. Oppenheim, "Chaldea," *IDB*, I, pp. 549-550.

[6] Cf. the following: F. M. Th. de Liagre Böhl, "Missions-und Erwählungsgedanke in Alt-Israel," *Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet*, eds. W. Baumgartner, *et al*. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1950), pp. 92 ff.; Kurt Galling, *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels*, *BZAW*, XLVIII (1928); J. Hempel, "Die Wurzeln des Missionswillens im Glauben des AT," *ZAW*, LXVI (1954), pp. 244-272; H. H. Rowley, *The Missionary Message of the Old Testament* (London: The Carey Kingsgate Press, 1944).

[7] *ETI*, p. 69.

[8] *Ibid*., p. 69.

[9] *HS*, pp. 11, 19*.

[10] G. von Rad, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*, pp. 18-20. Cf. the criticisms by Paul Humbert in *ZAW*, LVIII (1940/41), pp. 45-46.

[11] Another attempt to solve the apparent inconsistency has been suggested by C. H. Gordon, "Abraham and the Merchants of Ura," *JNES*, XVII (1958), pp. 28-31.

[12] Cf. *KB*, pp. 559-560.

[13] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 163.

[14] E. Nielsen, *Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation* (2nd ed. rev.; Copenhagen: Gad, 1959), p. 214.

[15] Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 127.

[16] Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, pp. 24-25, 413.

[17] Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, p. 226.

[18] Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 243.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 243.

[20] Smend, *Die Erzählungen*, p. 52, "Ohne Frage ist 26$^{1-11}$ die ältere der beiden Versionen."

[21] E.g., Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 251.

[22] Cf. the reference to the Tree of Life in Gen. 2:9. It is ignored until 3:29 when there is some point in mentioning it once more. It is surely unnatural to suggest that the mention of Lot in 13:1 is a later gloss, thus having the narrative conform to the theory that Lot was not mentioned in the account of the journey to Egypt, e.g. Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, p. 229 and Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 172.

[23] This was noted by Eerdmans, *Die Komposition der Genesis*, p. 86.

[24] E. Meyer-B. Luther, *Die Israeliten*, pp. 122 ff.

[25] U. Cassuto, *Documentary Hypothesis*, pp. 78-83.

[26] If vss. 3-4 are by a later writer it would appear that in the primary narrative the separation between Abraham and Lot took place in the Negeb. This has some direct bearing on the traditional location of Sodom, which was apparently near the place of separation; see 13:10 and the discussion of 19:17-23 below.

[27] Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, p. 230.

[28] *ETI*, p. 72.

[29] Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, pp. 23-24.

[30] *Genesis*, p. 175.

[31] *ETI*, p. 72.

[32] *Genesis*, p. 141.

[33] Gunkel noted this briefly, see *Genesis*, p. 176.

[34] *Genesis*, p. 253. Cf. the comment by Georg Fohrer, "Zum Text von JES. xli 8-13," *VT*, V (1955), p. 241.

II GENESIS 16

This chapter relates the story of how Sarah, Abraham's wife, realizing that she was incapable of bearing a child, suggested that he have intercourse with her Egyptian slave girl Hagar in the hope that she might conceive. Abraham followed her suggestion and Hagar became pregnant. When Hagar realized her condition she put on such airs that her mistress became jealous and insisted on having the maid driven out of the household. Hagar journeyed into the desert where she was met by the angel of YHWH who ordered her to return home.

Vss. 1-3. Abraham and Hagar.

Most critics since Dillmann[1] have assigned all, or part, of vs. 1 to P since the fact that Sarah was incapable of bearing a child has already been mentioned in 11:30, a passage which is usually assigned to J. It is unlikely that J, who is generally sparing of words, would repeat this notice. A further reason advanced for assigning vs. 1 to P is that the P account is thereby provided with a notice of Sarah's barrenness which it would otherwise lack.

Verse 3 has also been assigned to P because: (i) it interrupts the natural connection between vss. 2 and 4; (ii) it duplicates vs. 2 to some extent; (iii) it displays an interest in chronology, characteristic of P; (iv) the expression ארץ כנען.

The arguments for assigning vs. 3 to P appear to be sound with the exception of (iv) which was mentioned in the discussion of 11:31, where it was suggested that the expression was not used exclusively by P. The same cannot be said for vs. 1, either in whole or in part. The cogency of the argument for assigning vs. 1a to P depends on the source of 11:30, which states that "Sarai was barren, without any child". The usual assumption is that 11:30 belongs to the primary J source, but it has been suggested above that the primary J account began in 12:1. If this is correct, the difficulties which critics have found in attributing vs. 1a to J vanish. The reference in 16:1 would be J's first mention of Sarah's barrenness.

The customary assignment of vs. 1a to P creates a serious problem in that it deprives ולה in vs. 1b of an antecedent. If vs. 1a is assigned to a different source, it must be assumed that something similar once stood in the J story. This in itself is sufficient to show the weakness of the usual analysis. Simpson tries to solve the problem by supposing that in J, vs. 1b began with לשרי rather than לה, the change having been made by R^P.[2] The need for such an assumption is done away with when it is realized that the P material need not present a complete account, parallel to J, but may be a series of comments on J. If this be so--and further evidence that this is the case will be encountered below--P would not necessarily contain an account of Sarah's barrenness, since this was already mentioned in the story which he was incorporating.

Vss. 4-9. Hagar expelled and ordered to return.

Critics have generally agreed that vss. 4-8 belong to J, while vs. 9 is held to be a redactional note designed to get Hagar back home and thus pave the way for the incorporation of the second account of her expulsion in ch. 21 (see App. D). There is considerable force, however, in Dillmann's contention that it would be strange to have the angel find a helpless, pregnant woman in the wilderness and leave her there to die[3]--which would be the logical conclusion to the story if vs. 9 were deleted from the primary narrative. Furthermore, the use of the term גברת as in vs. 8, and the play on ענה (cf. vs. 6), constitute stylistic links which favor the view that vs. 9 is by the same author as the previous verses.

Vss. 10-12. Promises to Hagar.

These verses relate a series of promises made to Hagar by the angel of YHWH. In vs. 10 Hagar is promised numerous offspring; in vs. 11 the angel gives a formulaic announcement of her pregnancy and instructs her to name the child Ishmael; vs. 12 relates the destiny of her child.

Critics have suggested several reasons for regarding these verses as the work of more than one writer: (i) It is improbable that the same writer would have introduced both vss. 10 and 11 with the words ויאמר לה מלאך יהוה . The stylistic problem is aggravated further by the occurrence of the same words at the beginning of vs. 9, to say nothing of the reference to the angel of YHWH in vs. 7.[4] (ii) As the narrative stands, the promise in vs. 10 of numerous descendants to Hagar comes too soon, since it precedes the announcement that she is pregnant (vs. 11).[5] (iii) The derivation of the name Ishmael given in vs. 11 is forced and unnatural. A more natural explanation requires that the divine name El or Elohim be employed, not YHWH. Furthermore, the use of the verb "to hear" before "affliction" (עני) is unnatural since there is no mention of Hagar uttering any complaint which YHWH might have heard, and because the verb normally used with "affliction" is "to see", e.g. ראה ראיתי את־עני עמי אשר במצרים את צעקתם שמעתי Exod. 3:7; cf. also Gen. 31:42; Exod. 4:31, etc. (iv) Simpson has pointed to the inconsistency of referring to YHWH in the first person in vs. 10, and in the third person in vs. 11.[6] As a result of these arguments, vs. 10 is generally regarded as being secondary and vss. 11-12 are assigned to J (see App. D).

The repetition of ויאמר לה מלאך יהוה at the beginning of no fewer than three consecutive verses, 9, 10 and 11, appears to be the strongest argument against believing that they come from one hand. Since each of these verses contains a specific divine pronouncement, it may be that the formulaic nature of the material was felt by the writer to require a statement in each instance emphasizing that an oracle was being given by YHWH's spokesman.

The intent of these verses is clearly to fix the destiny of Ishmael and his descendants in a manner befitting a son of Abraham. Verse 10 states that these descendants will be numerous, in keeping with the promise that Abraham was to father many nations (12:2-3). On the other hand, the Ishmaelites will be wild men, living at odds with the rest of mankind.[7] To assign either of these verses to a different source would upset the balance of the oracle. Verse 11 is also incorporated into this pattern and provides the necessary antecedent for והוא in vs. 12.

The argument that the promise to Hagar in vs. 10 comes too soon and hence cannot be by the same hand as the announcement of her pregnancy in vs. 11 is scarcely valid since her pregnancy was the cause of the expulsion as vs. 4 indicates. It is likely that the promise was placed first to soften the blow for Hagar who was ordered, in vs. 9, to return to her mistress and submit to her. The inconsistency in regard to person is to be explained by noting that the angel of YHWH is the speaker. Even when YHWH, rather than the angel of YHWH is the subject, Hebrew usage allows him to refer to himself in the third person (cf. 18:14 and Josh. 1:9).

The only remaining argument against the unity of these verses has to do with the derivation of the name Ishmael. It is not sufficient to suggest, as Simpson does, that the original reading was El and that this was changed to YHWH by J2,[8] for it is difficult to believe that a change of that sort would have been made in a written source. The name does, however, show that it is based on an El tradition. It is more likely that the author was acquainted with the story in ch. 21 where the natural etymology "Elohim heard" is given (see 21:17) and where the verb "heard" is followed by a perfectly natural object, viz. "the sound of the child". The writer responsible for 16:10-12 appears to have employed the divine name YHWH deliberately in order to emphasize the fact that the god involved in the revelation to Hagar (an Egyptian but nonetheless Abraham's concubine and the mother of his child) was none other than YHWH. The result is that the etymology given sounds somewhat unnatural. It is doubtful if such an awkward etymology would have been allowed to stand in a source such as J which gives evidence elsewhere of having been refined and polished during a long period of oral transmission. If vss. 10-12 are taken as a unit, it would appear that they may be regarded as a secondary expansion of the primary narrative.[9]

Vss. 13-14. El-roi and Beer-lahai-roi.

Most critics assign these verses to J (see App. D). Simpson, however, regards them as E for the following reasons: (i) There is no account of the birth of Ishmael in ch. 21 which is assigned to E; (ii) the key word here is "seeing" while in the preceding verses YHWH's "hearing" is stressed; (iii) Ishmael is here connected with Beer-lahai-roi, but according to 25:11 (which he calls J) Isaac resided there; (iv) the use of the divine name YHWH in vs. 13 is "impossible, and is due to redactional harmonization; the original must have been and she called the name of the god that spake, etc."[10]

It is quite true that one would expect the statement in vs. 13 to have the form which Simpson suggests, with El or Elohim in place of YHWH. But once again the author appears to have sacrificed literary style to theological considerations. He wishes to make it quite clear that the divine Being who spoke to Hagar, and whom she in her ignorance called El-roi, was none other than YHWH. The awkwardness of vs. 13 thus appears to be the result of the writer's attempt to achieve an end similar to that in vs. 11. An original El tradition has been used in a new context which is manifestly Yahwistic. This may suggest that vs. 13 is by the same hand as vs. 11. Simpson's other arguments are not entirely convincing. The fact that ch. 21 contains no account of Ishmael's birth is no reason for assigning 16:13-14 to E. These verses do not contain any clear record of a birth either, and it is furthermore unlikely that the final editor would have permitted two accounts of the same birth to remain. In regard to the stress on "seeing" in vss. 13-14, and to "hearing" in vs. 11, it may be pointed out that a reference to the latter is required in order to explain the origin of the name Ishmael, while the former is required to explain the names El-roi and Beer-lahai-roi. This provides no ground for attributing the references to "hearing" and "seeing" to different sources. Simpson's argument based on 25:11 is not really relevant, since 16:13-14 neither asserts nor hints that Beer-lahai-roi was where Ishmael was born or where he later lived.

Verses 13-14 seem deliberately designed to provide a theological complement to the story of Hagar's expulsion in ch. 21. There God is one who hears (cf. 21:17); here YHWH is one who sees as well as hears. This development, as well as the employment of the word "well", may have been suggested by the reference in 21:19 to God's opening Hagar's eyes so that she saw a well with the result that her life and that of her child were saved. A double word-play is thus likely intended in these verses. Obviously the two key words are "seeing" and "living". Hagar is amazed at being alive after seeing the Deity. On the other hand, according to ch. 21 her *life* and that of Ishmael were spared because she *saw* a well. If this is the point at which the writer was driving, his telling of the story was no doubt influenced by his desire to stress these two key words. This raises doubts as to whether or not a deity called אל ראי or a place באר לחי ראי ever existed, although it is probable that there was some basis in tradition for the name.[11] If the reading יהוה is retained in vs. 13, there can be no doubt that vss. 13-14 are the work of a J writer. On the other hand, it would appear that they are not from the same hand as vs. 7, which belongs to the basic J story. Verse 14 refers to the water-hole where the theophany to Hagar occurred as a "well" (באר) and locates it between Kadesh and Bered, whereas vs. 7 calls it a "spring" (עין) and locates it "on the road to Shur".[12]

The above considerations combine to suggest that vss. 10-14 were not a part of the primary J tradition but are an amplification from a later writer who used the divine name YHWH. In fact, he went to considerable pains to give a Yahwistic stamp to the traditions with which he worked.

The identification of "the God of seeing" who appeared to Hagar with YHWH belongs to that circle of Hebrew thought which maintained that YHWH was present in the land of Canaan in the patriarchal period but was not known as such, being worshipped by the patriarchs under the name of *El*. This idea receives its most explicit formulation at the hands of P in Ex. 6:3, "I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as *El Shaddai*, but by my name YHWH I did not make myself known to them." While such a theory may have been current as early as the time of J (usually dated in the ninth century B.C. or earlier), there is no evidence for such an assumption. It seems more likely that such a notion was the product of later theological speculation, as the P material suggests. A similar problem will be faced in connection with 14:22; 21:33, and will be dealt with later in more detail.

Vss. 15-16. The birth of Ishmael.

Critics agree that these verses are from P for the following reasons: (i) their interest in chronology; (ii) the "stiff and formal precision of the style";[13] (iii) the naming of the child by the father. Cassuto has questioned the validity of the last argument,[14] but it is still a fact that in the material in Genesis attributed to P, the father regularly names the child. In any case, the other reasons mentioned are sufficient to warrant acceptance of the view that these verses are of P authorship.

Verses 15-16 present the only extant account of the birth of Ishmael. Since the J story had Hagar become pregnant it is obvious that it too must have had a story of the birth of the child. Whether in J the child was named Ishmael, and if so, how the name was explained, cannot now be determined. If either primary or secondary J writers, or both, had accounts of the birth of Ishmael, it would appear as if P has suppressed this material in order to tell the story in his own way. Once again it is clear that the P material is a supplement to an existing story, for vss. 3, 15-16 fail to give any explanation of the child's name, and are so brief they would have conveyed little to a reader who did not also know the story in vss. 1, 2-14.

The results of the above analysis may be summarized as follows:

J--vss. 1-2, 4-9
X--vss. 10-14
P--vss. 3, 15-16.

The material designated as X is worked into the J story at the most appropriate place, much in the manner seen in chs. 12-13. At the point at which the divine messenger gives Hagar instructions to return home, the writer is able to include his oracles and theological word-plays. Having the J narrative break off where it does also makes room for the story in ch. 21 as a sequel. It is obvious that both X and P had no separate existence apart from the J narrative; both were added as commentary.

Finally, the generally held theory that the entire episode related in ch. 16 is from a J source different from the basic narrative in chs. 12, 13, 18, etc. must be examined (see App. D). The following arguments have been advanced for such a view: (i) ch. 18 is the logical continuation of 13:18;[15] (ii) Abraham is presented in an unfavourable light;[16] (iii) the topography implies that Abraham was living in the Negeb whereas in the primary J narrative he resided at Hebron.[17]

It is true that both 13:18 and 18:1 refer to the same spot, namely, "the terebinths of Mamre" at Hebron, and both represent Abraham as living there, but this provides no ground for believing that ch. 18 at one time followed immediately upon ch. 13. Much may have taken place between Abraham's settling at Hebron and the visit of the celestial beings narrated in ch. 18. In fact, the occurrence of the words באלני ממרא in both 13:18 and 18:1 is evidence that 18:1 did not follow 13:18, since the repetition would be unnecessary. Critics attempt to solve the difficulty by deleting one or the other as a secondary comment, whereas Gunkel avoided the difficulty by calling 18:1a "eine Überschrift".[18]

The second argument given for regarding ch. 16 as secondary, namely, the unfavourable portrayal of Abraham, is also unconvincing since Abraham is depicted in similar fashion in 12:9-20, which was seen to be part of the J narrative. In fact, ch. 16 shows a clear point of contact with 12:9-20. Hagar is called an Egyptian שפחה in 16:1 (cf. 12:16 where it is stated that Pharaoh presented Abraham with שפחת). Simpson attempts to weaken the connection by claiming that in ch. 16 Hagar is portrayed as a bedouin girl, not as an Egyptian, and that the epithet מצרית was introduced into vs. 1 by R^P on the basis of vs. 3.[19] The Egyptian ancestry of Hagar is attested, however, in 21:9 and also implied in 21:21.

The argument that ch. 16 represents Abraham as living in the Negeb whereas in the basic J strand he lives at Hebron is without foundation. There is nothing in ch. 16 to suggest that Abraham was living in the Negeb. The most that can be inferred from vs. 7 is that he resided somewhere north of "the spring on the way to Shur", and this could well have been at Hebron.

Simpson suggests that ch. 16 originally followed 13:1 rather than 13:18, since "13:1 calls for some occurrence in the Negeb," and ch. 16 is apparently unaware of the promise of an heir to Abraham (15:4) judging from the "casual abandonment of the unborn child" by Abraham.[20] This latter argument appears to have some merit, but see the discussion of ch. 15 below. There is, therefore, no good reason for disputing the J authorship of the basic story in ch. 16, or for believing that it once held a position in the J tradition different from that which it now occupies.

NOTES ON CHAPTER II

[1] Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, p. 253.

[2] *ETI*, p. 71.

[3] Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, p. 253.

[4] Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, p. 21.

[5] *Ibid*., p. 21; *ETI*, p. 71.

[6] *ETI*, p. 71.

[7] On the meaning of על פני see Speiser, *Genesis*, p. 118.

[8] *ETI*, p. 71.

[9] Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 287, stated that vs. 10 is "made up of phrases characteristic of redactional additions to JE."

[10] *ETI*, p. 71.

[11] G. von Rad, *Das Erste Buch Mose*, *ATD*, p. 165. Cf. also F. V. Winnett, *The Mosaic Tradition*, pp. 130-133, 149 on the substitution of *Massah* and *Meribah* for well-known place-names. Wellhausen's suggestion that לחי ראי originally meant "antelope's jawbone" has attracted some following, cf. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1872), p. 213. This is accepted by Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 152, and Simpson, *Genesis*, *IB*, Vol. I, p. 607.

[12] Simons, *GTTOT*, p. 217, suggests that if the spring mentioned in vs. 7 is identified with the modern bijār majīn, it could be located between Kadesh and Bered, that is, "if the latter name is connected with gebel umm el-bāred."

[13] Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 285.

[14] U. Cassuto, *Documentary Hypothesis*, pp. 65-66.

[15] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 184.

[16] Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 285.

[17] *Ibid*., p. 285.

[18] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 193.

[19] *ETI*, p. 71.

[20] *Ibid*., p. 70.

III GENESIS 17

This chapter is assigned to P by most critics, with a few possible additions by a later hand (see App. D). The subject matter of the chapter falls into four sections:

(i) Vss. 1-8--YHWH appears to Abram and announces that the latter will become a multitude of nations and that kings will issue from him. Therefore his name is to be changed to Abraham, said to mean "father of nations". God promises to give the land of Canaan to Abraham and his descendants as an eternal possession.

(ii) Vss. 9-14--The rite of circumcision is prescribed for Abraham and all the male members of his household as well as for all their descendants for ever. This rite is to be the mark of their covenant relationship to YHWH.

(iii) Vss. 15-22--Sarai is henceforth to be known as Sarah, meaning "princess". God announces that she is to bear a son and to become the mother of nations; and מלכי עמים will descend from her. Abraham laughed (ויצחק) at the prospect of fathering a son at the age of 100 and from a wife 90 years of age. The son is to be called Isaac (יצחק), and the covenant is to be with his descendants. Ishmael is not forgotten for God promises to bless him as well and to make him a great nation and the father of twelve princes.

(iv) Vss. 23-27--The command regarding circumcision is carried out.

While most critics are content to assign ch. 17 to P, others have asked whether or not this chapter, and hence P in general, is a unity or the work of more than one writer. Since the P material in the Patriarchal Stories is of rather limited extent, it will not be possible to speak with any certainty regarding the work of P in general. The views of several scholars with regard to ch. 17 are noted here, but full discussion is not possible at this point.[1]

In spite of some unevenness of style ch. 17 shows evidence of carefully planned construction and balanced arrangement. The first section (vss. 1-8), relating the change of Abram's name to Abraham, is complemented by the third section (vss. 15-22), relating the new name given to his wife. Section two (vss. 9-14), which gives the divine command to institute the rite of circumcision, is balanced by section four (vss. 23-27), which states that he carried out this command. The parallel passages should not be taken as doublets but rather as reinforcements of one another. It is clear that earlier traditions have been incorporated into the present form of the chapter, as may be seen in the "Tora" dealing with circumcision in vss. 12-13.[2] The net result, however, is a carefully constructed narrative which is in harmony with P material in the chapters which precede and follow. That is, Abraham is exactly 100 years of age when Isaac is born and Ishmael's age also is in keeping with this scheme (cf. 16:15-16). Much of the controversy regarding the inclusion or exclusion of Ishmael and the age at which he was circumcised misses the point, since it is obvious that the writer of this material desired to write an account which would accommodate all the known traditions at his disposal.

Finally, reference should be made to the fact that no fewer than three divine names occur in this chapter: יהוה (vs. 1), אל שדי (vs. 1), and אלהים (vss. 3, 9, 15, 19, 22, 23; האלהים in vs. 18). Elsewhere in Genesis P uses Elohim exclusively when speaking of the Deity, and has the Deity reveal himself to the patriarchs as El Shaddai. In this chapter the name YHWH is found only in the author's introduction to the story (vs. 1), not in the Deity's disclosure of himself to Abraham. The occurrence of the name YHWH is, therefore, not contrary to P's assertion in Ex. 6:3 that God was not made known to the patriarchs as YHWH, but only as El Shaddai. Nonetheless it is surprising to find P employing the name YHWH at all. Dillmann suggested that YHWH (vs. 1) was the work of a later redactor who wanted to stress that Elohim and YHWH were really one and the same God,[3] but this is not a completely satisfactory solution since other opportunities to equate the two names could also have been seized. It is more likely that while P did not wish to minimize the significance of the revelation to Moses, he could not entirely overlook the solemnity of the covenant with Abraham recorded in ch. 17. Hence he was willing to make an exception to his usual practice and use YHWH in this story which to him is manifestly the climax of his story of Abraham.

The entire chapter is to be assigned to P.

NOTES ON CHAPTER III

[1] Steuernagel noted that in some verses all the descendants of Abraham are represented as sharing in the covenant, whereas in others the promise is restricted to Isaac and his descendants. Beginning with a study of vss. 4-8, he observed that vss. 4-6 speak of "nations", but that vss. 7-8 deal with the covenant with Israel. Commenting on the latter verses, he stated, "Es ist klar, dass diese ברית --Zusagen nur auf die Israeliten Bezug haben können, denn nur ihr Gott ist Jahwe und nur ihnen gehört das Land Kanaan"; see *Festschrift Karl Budde*, *BZAW*, XXXIV (1920), p. 173. He then gathered all the statements which emphasize the all-inclusive viewpoint, and those with the particular Israelite stress, plus still later hands, and offered the following reconstruction:

A--1-6, 9, $10a^{ab}$, 11a, 15, 16b, 22, $23a^{a}$, b, 24-26;
B--7-8, 11b, 13b, 14, 16a, 17-21;
C--12a;
D--$10a^{b}$, 12b, 13a, $23a^{b}$, 27.

Von Rad refuses to accept Steuernagel's contention that vss. 7-8 are inconsistent with the mention of Abraham's seed as גוים in the previous verses. He feels that such an expression is "ein Verheissungselement" which became stereotyped alongside the promises of the land; see *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*, *BWANT*, Folge IV, Heft 13 (1934), p. 25. Max Löhr also rejected the unity of the chapter, and in keeping with his view of the development of the so-called P material (see above, p. 7), referred to ch. 17 as "in Wirklichkeit ein literarische Mosaik"; see *Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem, I. Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis*, *BZAW*, XXXVIII (1924), p. 11. Löhr does not mention the work of Steuernagel on ch. 17, although it appeared in the same series four years earlier. Gerhard von Rad also regards ch. 17 as composite but envisages only two writers, keeping within the framework of his theory that P is composed of two strands, P^A and P^B (see above, p. 7). His chief objection to accepting the unity of the chapter is that vss. 1-8, dealing with God's covenant with Abraham, and vss. 15-22 regarding the covenant with the son of Sarah appear to be doublets. Verses 15-22 are assigned by him to P^A, which he regards as of quite early date. Verses 1-8 are assigned to P^B, although von Rad believes that vss. 2-5, which relate the change of Abram's name to Abraham, once enjoyed a separate existence. He bases this theory on the view that 35:9-14, which relates the change of Jacob's name to Israel, is also secondary; see *Die Priesterschrift*, p. 25. Paul Humbert has strongly criticized von Rad's work, particularly his theory of doublets; see "Die literarische Zweiheit des Priester-Codex in der Genesis," *ZAW*, LVIII (1940-41), pp. 30-57. It is true that both vss. 1-8 and 15-22 mention a change in name (see vss. 5 and 15), both refer to the "nations" (vss. 4-5 and 16) and "kings" (vss. 6 and 16), both mention God establishing (הקים) an eternal covenant (see vss. 7 and 19), and both use the expression במאד מאד (vss. 2, 6 and 20). These facts used by von Rad to support a theory of doublets could just as well be used to show identity of authorship. The assignment of vss. 15-22, dealing with the restriction of the covenant to Isaac, to an early period does not take into account the development of Israel's particularism. It is difficult to believe that at an early period the covenant was restricted to Isaac, and only at a later period was it broadened to include Ishmael as well. The lateness of 35:10 is also not sufficient to warrant calling 17:5 late, since, as Humbert has suggested, ch. 35 could have been modelled on ch. 17 by a later writer; see "Die literarische Zweiheit des Priester-Codex in der Genesis," ZAW, p. 48.

[2] Gunkel, Genesis, p. 270. Cf. also Skinner, Genesis, p. 293.

[3] Die Genesis, p. 259.

IV GENESIS 18

Abraham, living among the terebinths of Mamre, entertains three visitors who, while they are refreshing themselves, make inquiry concerning his wife, Sarah. One of the visitors announces that he will return a year hence when Sarah will bear a son. Sarah, who has overheard the conversation, laughs at the prospect of becoming pregnant at her age. The men depart in the direction of Sodom and Abraham accompanies them part of the way. YHWH informs Abraham that he is going down to Sodom and Gomorrah to see if the two cities are as wicked as the outcry reaching heaven would suggest. Abraham raises the question whether it is right to destroy the righteous along with the wicked. After some discussion he succeeds in extracting a promise from YHWH that the city will not be destroyed if ten righteous people are to be found there. YHWH then departs and Abraham returns home.

Vss. 1-16. The promise of a son.

The chief problem presented by these verses is the strange vacillation in the use of the singular (vss. 3, 10, 14, 15) and the plural (vss. 4, 5, 8, 9). In vs. 2 three men are mentioned, whereas in vs. 3 Abraham directs his remarks to only one, calling him אדנָי (a term used only of the Deity) and using the 2nd masculine singular verb and suffixes. In order to achieve uniformity in the narrative a number of alternatives have been proposed by critics. Fripp suggested that the singular be read throughout.[1] Others have maintained that the solution lies in disentangling a "singular" strand from a "plural" narrative.[2] Gunkel felt that while it is possible to clarify the confusion to some extent, the two traditions became conflated at the pre-literary stage and were so completely woven together that they cannot be pulled apart.[3] Eerdmans felt that the confusion was caused when an originally polytheistic myth, in which all three visitors were gods, was adapted to allow for the presence of YHWH.[4] Skinner, on the other hand, held that the original story involved only human beings.[5] The problem hinges on whether or not YHWH was regarded as one of "the men". The attempt by von Rad to see YHWH revealed in all three men is not satisfactory.[6]

The only real problem in the first nine verses of the chapter is raised by vs. 3b, which represents Abraham as addressing only one of the visitors and calling him אדנָי , thus conveying the impression that he recognized his divine character at once. This impression is contrary, however, to the other verses which depict Abraham as receiving the visitors as humans, and treating them in accordance with accepted standards of hospitality. While it would be simple to repoint אדני as אדנִי or אדנַי, this would not solve the problem since vs. 3b in its entirety would have to be revised. In view of vs. 1 which asserts that the incident which follows was a theophany of YHWH,[7] it seems possible that the writer wanted it clearly understood from the beginning that YHWH was involved.

Problems arise once more when vs. 10 is reached, since in vss. 10-16 the verbs appear in the singular. Nor is the transition from vs. 9 to vs. 10 smooth, there being no proper antecedent in vs. 9 for ויאמר in vs. 10. Since YHWH is explicitly mentioned in vs. 13 it is clear that he is the speaker in these verses. It would be foolish to suggest that vss. 10 ff. are secondary since this would remove the point of the visit. The promise of a son by Sarah is the climax of the account.

Holzinger's suggestion that סלת in vs. 6 is a gloss by P,[8] might find support in the fact that YHWH's presence lent to the meal a semi-sacrificial character in the eyes of later readers. On the other hand, since סלת was not confined to offerings (see I Kings 5:2 and Ezek. 16:13, 19), it may simply indicate that the writer wished to stress that Abraham ordered up the best for his guests.

It is generally agreed by critics that this story is the work of J with some later additions (see App. D). Attempts to delete or modify certain verses have failed to clarify the problem; instead they have led to a mutilation of the story. As has been noted above, the promise to Sarah is the climax of the account and is a necessary link in the J story of Abraham. It would appear likely that J, faced with the necessity of providing a setting for the promise, selected a tradition of three men (divine beings?) sent to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah, and adapted the account by having it lead into the promise. This would also account for the rough transition between vs. 9 and vs. 10 where J's hand becomes more prominent. In telling the story of the visit of these men, a tale which may well have existed in oral form at the time, J attempted to prevent misunderstanding by stressing YHWH's presence from the start (vss. 1 and 3). However, he did not obliterate the men from his account, but permitted them to carry on polite conversation with Abraham (vss. 5 and 9), and thus prepare the way for the promise by YHWH.

Vss. 17-21. A further promise to Abraham.

Most critics, following Wellhausen, assign at least vss. 17-19 to secondary hands (see App. D). A number of reasons have been advanced in support of this view: (i) Verses 17-19 break the natural connection between vs. 16 and vs. 20. (ii) In vs. 17 YHWH has already determined to destroy Sodom, while in vss. 20-21 he decides to carry out a personal investigation first. (iii) The language and viewpoint of vs. 19 shows Deuteronomic influence. (iv) YHWH appears as one of the strangers, but further on reference is once more made to "the men" (cf. vs. 22).[9]

In regard to the first argument, there is no doubt that vs. 20 could form a natural sequel to vs. 16. In that case, vss. 17-19 are to be understood as a later theological reflection on the mark of special favor shown to Abraham by the disclosure of the divine purpose, presented in J as a simple statement of fact. The second argument is less weighty since, as Procksch has noted,[10] it is not clear that vs. 17 contradicts vss. 20-21. YHWH wonders whether he ought to tell Abraham of the situation including his proposed visit of inspection. Verse 17 does not necessarily imply that YHWH has already decided to destroy Sodom; it may merely refer to his plan to investigate conditions there. Argument (iii) dealing with the presence of Deuteronomic phraseology is significant. As Fripp pointed out, the verse bears some resemblance to Deut. 6:1-3 and 12:28.[11] The very principle that the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham's seed is contingent upon obedience is contrary to the remainder of the Abraham Story. Gunkel has rightly attributed this principle to prophetic influence.[12] Here Abraham is initiated into the plan of YHWH after the fashion of a prophet. One alternative would be to call only vs. 19 secondary.[13] The reasons listed above, however, suggest that vss. 17-19 belong together and constitute an intrusion into the J narrative.

Verses 20-21 are usually assigned to the primary J source (see App. D), and this assignment would seem to be justified by the need for some explanation in the J narrative of why the visitors now headed for Sodom. Furthermore, the words וחטאתם כי כבדה מאד in vs. 20 are reminiscent of ואנשי סדם רעים וחטאים ליהוה מאד in 13:13, which was regarded above as part of the J story. Objection might be raised to assigning vss. 20-21 to J on the ground that in them YHWH announces his intention of making a personal visit to Sodom and Gomorrah whereas in ch. 19 it is only his two companions who go there. However, they are YHWH's representatives, and their visit of inspection was probably regarded by the author as tantamount to a visit by YHWH himself. There is therefore no real discrepancy between vss. 20-21 and ch. 19.

Vss. 22-33. A debate concerning the fate of Sodom.

The secondary character of vss. 22b-33a was pointed out by Wellhausen,[14] and the majority of critics have been convinced by his arguments.[15] YHWH and Abraham are by themselves as they enter into a serious theological discussion. The whole tenor of the discussion stamps it, says Skinner, "as the product of a more reflective age than that in which the ancient legends originated."[16] The discussion bears remarkable affinities to Jeremiah 18, Ezekiel 14 and the Book of Job, all of which wrestle with the possibility of punishment being indiscriminate. The statement by Procksch that this passage deals with, "die Bedeutung des Frommen für die verschuldete Gesamtheit",[17] also has a good deal to commend it. The problem of the justice of God receives an earlier treatment in Genesis in the introduction to the Flood Story where an attempt is made to justify God's action in drowning the whole human race by emphasizing how wicked they had become.

Summary.

The examination of ch. 18 has shown that J material is to be found in vss. 1-16, 20-22a. The theme of the J story is the solemn announcement by YHWH, during a personal visit to Abraham, that Sarah will bear a son. The statement in vs. 33 ("YHWH went his way when he had finished speaking to Abraham, while Abraham returned to his place.") could follow logically after vs. 21, and this order would have the advantage of separating YHWH from the men who went on to Sodom. It is suggested that this was the original order of the J material, a later writer having changed the order of vss. 22a and 33 so that YHWH and Abraham might be by themselves for the discussion in vss. 22b-32. If vs. 22a were the original conclusion of the story, an easy transition to the story of Sodom and Gomorrah in ch. 19 results.

The J story has been expanded at two points: (i) vss. 17-19 which reflect on the reasons for the divine favor shown to Abraham. One of the verses (19) exhibits traces of Deuteronomic phraseology and the influence of prophetic thought; (ii) vss. 22b-32, an attempt to justify the total destruction visited upon Sodom by YHWH. For the present, these additions will be designated as X.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IV

[1] Edgar I. Fripp, "Note on Genesis XVIII. XIX," *ZAW*, XII (1892), p. 24.

[2] E.g. Richard Kraetzschmar, "Der Mythus von Sodoms Ende," *ZAW*, XVII (1897), pp. 81-92. Cf. also Smend, *Die Erzählung*, pp. 55 ff., and Eissfeldt, *HS*, pp. 257*-258*.

[3] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 194; Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 298.

[4] Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien*, I, p. 72; Gunkel, *Genesis*, pp. 199-200. Also J. Meinhold, "Die jahwistischen Berichte in Gen 12-50," *ZAW*, XXXIX (1921), pp. 42-57.

[5] *Genesis*, p. 299.

[6] *Genesis*, *ATD*, p. 173.

[7] In this sense Gunkel was justified in calling vs. 1a "eine Überschrift".

[8] *Genesis*, p. 153.

[9] E.g. Skinner, *Genesis*, pp. 298 and 303.

[10] *Die Genesis*, p. 123.

[11] *ZAW*, XII, p. 23.

[12] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 202.

[13] E.g. Noth, *ÜP*, p. 259.

[14] *Die Composition*, pp. 25-26.

[15] Cf. however, Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, p. 270; Procksch, *Die Genesis*, p. 122.

[16] *Genesis*, p. 305.

[17] *Die Genesis*, pp. 123-124.

V GENESIS 19

After leaving Abraham, the men proceed to Sodom and arrive there in the evening. Lot, sitting at the gate of the city, sees them and hastens to offer them accommodation for the night. After some urging, they consent. Before they retire for the night, an unruly mob of Sodomites--in fact, all the males of the city--surround the house and demand that Lot hand over his guests. Lot exhorts the crowd to commit no wickedness and even offers to hand over to them his two virgin daughters instead. The mob refuses to listen and tries to break into the house. The guests now move to protect their host and smite the Sodomites with blindness. At the same time, they order Lot to take his family and leave the city, telling him that YHWH has sent them to destroy it. Lot urges his future sons-in-law to leave but they think he is only joking. When dawn breaks, the angels urge Lot once more to leave immediately. When he delays they grasp him and his wife and daughters by the hand, conduct him outside the city and tell him to flee to the hills. Lot asks to be allowed to flee to a "little" town nearby, a town which henceforth becomes known as Zoar (little). Lot and his family reach there just as the sun rises, at which moment YHWH rains fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah, and overthrows not only them but the whole *kikkar*. Lot's wife disobeys the command not to look back and is changed into a pillar of salt. In the morning Abraham looks out in the direction of Sodom and Gomorrah and sees a column of smoke rising to heaven. There then follows a story of how Lot left Zoar and took up residence in the hill country where his two daughters contrived to make him drunk and have intercourse with him. From this incestuous union the Moabites and Ammonites are said to have sprung.

Vss. 1-11. The outrage at Sodom.

The reader is immediately struck by the fact that Yahweh's two

V GENESIS 19

After leaving Abraham, the men proceed to Sodom and arrive there in the evening. Lot, sitting at the gate of the city, sees them and hastens to offer them accommodation for the night. After some urging, they consent. Before they retire for the night, an unruly mob of Sodomites--in fact, all the males of the city--surround the house and demand that Lot hand over his guests. Lot exhorts the crowd to commit no wickedness and even offers to hand over to them his two virgin daughters instead. The mob refuses to listen and tries to break into the house. The guests now move to protect their host and smite the Sodomites with blindness. At the same time, they order Lot to take his family and leave the city, telling him that YHWH has sent them to destroy it. Lot urges his future sons-in-law to leave but they think he is only joking. When dawn breaks, the angels urge Lot once more to leave immediately. When he delays they grasp him and his wife and daughters by the hand, conduct him outside the city and tell him to flee to the hills. Lot asks to be allowed to flee to a "little" town nearby, a town which henceforth becomes known as Zoar (little). Lot and his family reach there just as the sun rises, at which moment YHWH rains fire and brimstone upon Sodom and Gomorrah, and overthrows not only them but the whole kikkar. Lot's wife disobeys the command not to look back and is changed into a pillar of salt. In the morning Abraham looks out in the direction of Sodom and Gomorrah and sees a column of smoke rising to heaven. There then follows a story of how Lot left Zoar and took up residence in the hill country where his two daughters contrived to make him drunk and have intercourse with him. From this incestuous union the Moabites and Ammonites are said to have sprung.

Vss. 1-11. The outrage at Sodom.

The reader is immediately struck by the fact that Yahweh's two companions, who in ch. 18 are referred to simply as האנשים, are here (in vs. 1) called "the two angels" (שני המלאכים). The same mode of reference is employed in vs. 15, but elsewhere in ch. 19 they are referred to simply as "the men" (vss. 5, 8, 10, 12, 16). It has been generally felt that the original reading must have been האנשים throughout. If, however, the J narrative in ch. 18 ended with vs. 22a ("Then the men turned from there and went to Sodom") the sequel in 19:1 will not have required a repetition of the subject. The insertion of the words שני המלאכים will then have been due to the writer who was responsible for the alterations of the J narrative in ch. 18. The employment of the term מלאכים rather than אנשים was probably dictated by a desire to make clear who Yahweh's two companions were and to remove any suspicion that they were gods. The use of the numeral "two" also emphasizes the fact that YHWH did not go down to Sodom and hence was not exposed to the depravity of the Sodomites.

Glosses have been found by some critics in vs. 4 (see App. D). The words אנשי סדם are said to be unnecessary after אנשי העיר and therefore secondary, especially since the J narrative is usually straightforward and free from embellishments. The same is said of כל־העם מקצה after מנער ועד־זקן. It is unwise, however, to make a pronouncement about J's style on the basis of the limited amount of material encountered and then reject everything which does not agree with it. The first example is merely the Hebrew way of saying "the men of the city of Sodom". In the second, the employment of repetition has the effect of emphasizing the fact that the entire population of the city was infected with evil. Neither example provides sufficient basis for a theory of dual authorship.

Verse 9 has also come in for some attention, most critics feeling that it is overloaded (see App. D). Suspicions regarding the unity of the verse are based on the repetition of ויאמרו and the expression כאיש בלוט. But the occurrence of an appositional construction is surely not adequate grounds for believing that the verse comes from more than one hand.

Vss. 12-16. Plans for destruction.

There can be little doubt that the word חתן (son-in-law) in vs. 12 is awkward, as most commentators have recognized (see App. D). Its lack of a suffix puts it out of harmony with its context. It is difficult, however, to determine why a later scribe would have inserted the expression in such a manner. Eissfeldt retains the word and considers בניך ובנתיך to be secondary. Simpson also deletes the latter two words as secondary (see App. D). But, surely the "angels" would have been represented as attempting to save Lot's entire family. To save Lot and let his family perish would be no salvation at all. There do not seem to be sufficient grounds for any deletion in vs. 12.

Verse 13 seems to present a problem in that the second part of the verse echoes the thought of the first half. Furthermore, the first part employs the Hiph'il of שחת and the 3rd masculine plural suffix with צעקה whereas the second part uses the Pi'el of שחת and the 3rd feminine singular suffix (לשחתה). The employment of two different themes of שחת may be due to a desire to avoid monotony. Nor is the problem posed by the suffixes serious. From a strictly grammatical point of view the suffix with צעקה should, of course, be the 3rd masculine singular form. On the other hand, if the two parts of vs. 13b are co-ordinate, no problem exists. Two reasons (outcry and divine commission) are offered as the basis for the destruction. Thus there are no real grounds for denying the unity of vs. 13. A further consideration in favor of regarding the first part of the verse at least as from the basic J source is that its language recalls that of 18:21, which was assigned to J.

The mention in vs. 14 of Lot's "sons-in-law who were to marry his daughters" sounds unnatural. This, and the fact that the sons-in-law play no further part in the story might suggest that they did not form an original feature of it. It may be, however, that J introduced them for dramatic effect, to serve as a fitting audience for his warning and to voice ridicule of it. Since the immediate members of Lot's family were to be saved, his prospective sons-in-law, here referred to as the ones "who were to marry his daughters", were not within the family circle and could be used as further illustration of the sinful conditions at Sodom.

The reference in vs. 15 to the men who visited Sodom as "angels" is doubtless due to the hand responsible for the previous reference to them in vs. 1.

The use of the singular suffixes in the latter part of vs. 16 appears on the surface to point to Lot's wife and his daughters being a later insertion in the earlier part of the verse. It is difficult, however, to remove Lot's family from the original narrative. Once the writer has mentioned them he focuses his attention on Lot, the central figure.

Vss. 17-23. Lot's intercession.

There is general agreement that these verses, at least to vs. 22, are secondary (see App. D). Up to this point in the story there has been a note of urgency. Now, Lot stops to argue the matter and suggests an alternative, namely that he be permitted to flee to a little city. The whole point of the "Intermezzo"[1] is to relate an aetiological tale about how the town Zoar got its name.

It would now appear that the purpose of the reference to Zoar in 13:10b was to bring the town into close relation with Sodom and thus prepare the way for the incorporation of the Zoar tale at this spot. Zoar is referred to in several other passages in Genesis (e.g., 19:22, 23, 30, 30; and 14:8; where it is identified with Bela). Deuteronomy 34:3 mentions Moses looking over the promised land from Mt. Nebo, apparently able to see as far as Zoar. Isaiah 15:5 and Jer. 48:34, in sections dealing with foreign nations, also make it clear that Zoar was in or near the territory of the Moabites. This is perhaps borne out by the episode related at the conclusion of ch. 19, although it is stated there that Lot and his daughters moved on from Zoar to the hills (vs. 30). If Zoar was in the general area of Sodom, yet visible from Mt. Nebo, and lying near Moabite territory, it is obvious that the writer must have located the Jordan Pentapolis at the north end of the Dead Sea. There is no general agreement today regarding the precise location of Zoar; in fact there are both "Northern" and "Southern" theories regarding the location of all the cities of the kikkar.[2] It is possible, therefore, that the writer's purpose for including stops between Bethel and Ai in 12:8 and 13:3-4 (the latter reference making it explicit that Abraham and Lot separated there, and Lot surveyed Sodom directly to the East) was to attempt to prove that the *kikkar* region actually lay in the vicinity of Bethel, i.e., north of the Dead Sea. The J story in ch. 13 states merely that Abraham and Lot separated after passing through the Negeb. It is possible that Sodom was located at the south end of the Dead Sea in the tradition related by J.

The episode concludes with vs. 23 which relates that at sunrise Lot came to Zoar. This advances the reference in vs. 15 which referred to the events at dawn (שחר).

It is suggested that these verses in their entirety are secondary and are designated as X.

Vss. 24-29. The destruction.

It is sometimes felt that there is a discrepancy between vss. 24 and 25 regarding the manner in which Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed. According to vs. 24 they were wiped out by fire and brimstone, whereas the use of the verb הפך (overthrow) in vs. 25 may suggest rather that they were overthrown by an earthquake. It is more likely that this verb is a general term for destruction and does not imply any particular method of destruction.

Most critics feel that the reference to Gomorrah and the last four words in vs. 24 are secondary additions (see App. D). It is true that Sodom alone is usually referred to (cf. 13:12; 19:1, 4) but J couples Gomorrah with Sodom in 18:20, as do other references in Hebrew literature to this event.[3] It would have been very difficult to bring Gomorrah into the picture when narrating the events described in the first part of ch. 19 but it was doubtless always understood that the behaviour of the Sodomites was typical of all the inhabitants of the *kikkar* and that all the cities of that region were destroyed.

The latter part of vs. 24 has caused commentators trouble because of the repetition of יהוה , but the remark is clearly designed to point out where the fire and brimstone came from; they came not from a volcano but directly from YHWH himself in heaven.

Verse 26, which relates that Lot's wife was turned into a pillar of salt because she looked back, is related to vs. 17 which says that Lot was ordered not to look back and is doubtless by the same hand. Verse 26 appears to be an afterthought following the account of the destruction. It is probable that at some time following the composition of the J account a tradition which associated a peculiar rock formation in the Dead Sea area with Lot's wife became sufficiently well known to merit consideration in any revision of the Lot legend. This was the most appropriate spot in the narrative for its inclusion, The expression מאחרין has given trouble to commentators because of the apparent absence of an immediate antecedent for the suffix. It is likely that this construction should be translated, "behind (her at) it" (viz. at the destruction mentioned in vs. 25).

In vs. 27 the absence of a complementary verb after וישכם creates a difficulty which the editors of Kittel's Biblia Hebraica have attempted to solve by supplying וילך although there is no textual support for such an insertion. The first word in vs. 28 would be an adequate continuation of vs. 27a, and would make good sense. Verse 27b has the marks of an intrusion into the narrative, designed to reinforce the reference to the discussion carried on by YHWH and Abraham concerning the doom of Sodom (18:22, 33). It is only fitting that Abraham return to the spot to witness the results. By attributing vs. 27b to a later hand the need for emending the text disappears. If this solution is correct, it would point strongly to such a writer having had a written source at his disposal. It is most unlikely that an editor would construct a sentence such as is presently found in vs. 27 if he were remoulding an oral tradition. Apparently, he religiously preserves the exact wording of his source and works in whatever comments he can at the most appropriate junctures. In the process, the flow of the story is often impeded. Such a sacrifice was deemed permissible for the sake of including as much relevant material as possible.

Doubts have been cast on the originality of the words ועל־כל־פני ארץ הככר in vs. 28a on the ground that the J narrative does not seem to have envisaged the destruction of more than Sodom and Gomorrah. But this is begging the question. The reference to הארץ in vs. 28b requires a previous mention of it to make clear what land is meant, and this requirement is met by the above-mentioned phrase in 28a. Thus all of vs. 28 may with confidence be assigned to J. It is evident, then, that the J-form of the legend envisaged the destruction of all the cities of the kikkar.

Verse 29 is universally attributed to P (see App. D). There are several signs of P's authorship and style in this verse: (i) the divine name אלהים; (ii) the repetitive style characteristic of P; (iii) "God remembered Abraham", cf. Gen. 8:1 ("God remembered Noah"); (iv) P's fondness for summary verses, cf. his additions in Gen. 10 (vss. 5, 20, 31, 32). This verse provides no real summary to the story, nor does it round out the account.[4] The purpose of its writer is clearly to emphasize the notion that God spared Lot for Abraham's sake, not because of any righteousness which Lot himself possessed. The notion advanced by Procksch that 19:29 was originally placed after 13:12, in the P document,[5] is of little help in explaining its present location and purpose. Gunkel's theory that it is from a lost genealogy of Lot is equally tenuous.[6] It is certain that the writer of this verse is acquainted with the account in the preceding verses. He alludes to the הפכה and the destruction of the cities, even stating that Lot lived "in them".

Vss. 30-38. Lot and his daughters.

This section, dealing with the origin of the Moabites and Ammonites, is generally regarded as part of the basic narrative (see App. D). Wellhausen felt justified in attributing it to the basic source since J would hardly leave Lot stranded at Zoar. He wrote, "das Endziel für Lot ist notwendigerweise das Gebirge Moab 19, 30."[7] Eissfeldt attributes the verses to L since Lot plays an important role in these verses as he does in 12:1-8.[8] Such evidence is as indecisive as that marshalled in connection with the omission of Lot in 12:9-20. It is very doubtful if a convincing argument can be presented for regarding the story as a part of the basic J narrative. No reference to Zoar has been encountered previously in J, whereas in secondary material there have been several references to it, the most noteworthy being in vss. 17-23 preceding.

It is quite inconceivable that this is an old Moabite tradition now incorporated into the corpus of Hebrew stories.[9] Genesis 36:20, 29, which mention a Lotan first among the Horite (pre-Edomite) inhabitants of Se'ir, may indicate that there was in circulation in Transjordan a tradition to the effect that Lotan was the ancestor of the peoples of Moabite and Ammonite regions.[10] It is doubtful, however, if such a tradition would have assumed the form of the story found in Gen. 19:30-38. The latter may well be an attempt to harmonize Transjordanian tradition with the Palestinian story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. If according to the Palestinian tradition only Lot and his wife and daughters survived the catastrophe, the question would arise as to how Lot could be the ancestor of the Moabites and Ammonites. The story in 19:30-38 may be an attempt to answer that question.

Although it is often assumed that aetiological stories are of early date, it is obvious that aetiological speculation was not confined to any one historical period, as the work of the Chronicler shows (see, e.g. I Ch. 4:14; 13:11; 14:11; etc.).

Summary.

The results of the investigation of the literary structure of ch. 19 may be summarized as follows:

J--vss. 1 (omitting שני המלאכים)-15 (omitting המלאכים), 16, 24-25, 27a, 28;

X--vss. 1 (only שני המלאכים), 15 (only המלאכים), 17-23, 26, 27b, 30-38.

P--vs. 29.

The basic J story, as identified by the above analysis, presents a vivid, smoothly flowing account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and the devastation of the whole area around them. Into it has been inserted at a subsequent time three notes of an aetiological character: (i) vss. 17-23 which presume to give the origin of the place-name Zoar; (ii) vs. 26, evidently a legend from the Dead Sea area which identified some natural rock formation with Lot's wife; (iii) vss. 30-38 which attempt to explain the origin of the Moabites and Ammonites. The fact that these supplements can be detached without disturbing the basic story suggests that the latter was in fixed form, probably in writing, when they were added. The narrative received minor annotation with regard to the "angels" (vss. 1 and 15) and a brief note connecting the episode with YHWH's prior conversation with Abraham (vs. 27b). One comment was added by P, namely, the observation that God spared Lot for Abraham's sake (vs. 29).

NOTES ON CHAPTER V

[1] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 206.

[2] Simons, *GTTOT*, pp. 222 ff.; see also *BA*, V (1942), pp. 17-32. Ancient views regarding its location as well as those held in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries may be noted in Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, p. 273; and Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 309.

[3] See Deut. 29:33; Amos 4:11; Isa. 1:9, 10; 13:19.

[4] P. Volz, *Der Elohist als Erzähler*, p. 137, suggests that vs. 29 is to give a positive ending to the story. He calls it "eines redaktionellen Schlusssatzes."

[5] *Die Genesis*, p. 499.

[6] *Genesis*, p. 261.

[7] *Die Composition*, pp. 26-27.

[8] *HS*, p. 12.

[9] von Rad, *Genesis*, *ATD*, pp. 190-191; Gunkel, *Genesis*, pp. 217-218.

[10] Lot's possible connection with the Horites has been discussed by A. Lods, "La caverne de Lot," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, XCV (1927), pp. 204-219.

VI GENESIS 20-22

Chapters 20-22 relate four episodes in the life of Abraham: (i) the taking of his wife Sarah into the harem of Abimelech, king of Gerar (20:1-18); (ii) the birth of Isaac and the expulsion of Hagar and her son Ishmael (21:1-21); (iii) the covenant between Abraham and Abimelech at Beersheba (21:22-34); (iv) the testing of Abraham's faith (22:1-19). The last story is followed by a genealogy giving a list of the descendants of Nahor, Abraham's brother (22:20-24). Since the three chapters have certain features in common, they are best studied as a group. After the various episodes have been examined, the general character of the material will be assessed.

1. 20:1-18. Sarah taken into the harem of Abimelech, king of Gerar.

The sudden transition from the use of the divine name YHWH, which has been used consistently in the preceding non-P parts of the Abraham Story, to Elohim (vss. 3, 13, 17) or האלהים (vss. 6, 17) is striking and requires some explanation. The most natural explanation is that a new source has been encountered. Cassuto denied the validity of employing the divine names as a criterion for source analysis, and accounted for the change to Elohim in 20:3 by noting that a foreigner, Abimelech, is involved. It would be blasphemous to have a non-Hebrew use the name YHWH.[1] There may be some truth in this comment. The explanation, however, fails to account for the employment of Elohim in vs. 17, where Abraham is involved, nor does it explain the sudden change back to the use of YHWH in vs. 18. The majority of critics are agreed that ch. 20 is an excerpt from a source which they designate by the symbol E (see App. D).

The unity of vss. 1-17 is generally accepted, though Simpson regards several passages as secondary:[2] (i) In vs. 1 he takes the expressions "and he dwelt between Kadesh and Shur" and "and he sojourned in Gerar" as doublets, assigning vs. 1a to J and vs. 1b to E. The clauses are not parallel, however, but complementary. The verbs ישב and גור denote two different kinds of "dwelling", the one more or less permanent, the other temporary. It is stated that Abraham moved to that part of the Negeb lying between Kadesh and Shur, but sojourned for a time at Gerar.[3] (ii) Since the reference to Abraham being a prophet (vs. 7) does not fit the date which Simpson assigns to E (700 B.C.), he assigns כי־נביא הוא ויתפלל בעדך in vs. 7 and all of vs. 17 to E^2. Such a solution clearly begs the question concerning the date of E. (iii) Verse 13 is declared to be an attempt by R^{JE} to harmonize ch. 20 with 12:10 ff. However, there does not appear to be any discrepancy between 12:11 and 20:2; hence vs. 13 may well be the work of E himself. (iv) Simpson's view that the words ועבדים ושפחת in vs. 14 are secondary is not substantiated and seems to be inspired by the belief that שפחה never occurs in E material.[4] (v) As noted above, Simpson assigns vs. 17 to E^2 because nothing has been said previously about any sickness inflicted upon Abimelech and his household. This is hardly sufficient reason for assigning the verse to a secondary hand. It is possible that the E story assumed knowledge of certain facts on the part of the reader, as shall be suggested below.

Verse 1 does not appear to be the beginning of the E story, since משם requires some antecedent. One can only speculate on what may have preceded. If E were a separate literary source, it would seem reasonable to assume that its story of Abraham closely followed the pattern of the J account. If so, the place from which Abraham moved must have been Hebron. On the other hand, if the E story were a mere supplement to the J account, no problem arises since chs. 18 and 19 make it clear that Abraham was living at Hebron.

There are insufficient grounds, on the whole, for disputing the unity of vss. 1-17. Verse 18, however, employs the divine name YHWH, which suggests that it is by a different hand from the rest of the chapter. Procksch attempted to retain the verse for E by changing the divine name to Elohim.[5] Most critics, however, regard the verse as a later addition by a redactor who felt that vs. 17 required elaboration (see App. D). There is little merit in the suggestion that the original reading at the end of vs. 17 was וִילָדָו , which was misread by a scribe who was then forced to add vs. 18 to make his story consistent.[6] It appears more likely that this verse is the work of a writer who incorporated the E story into a fuller Life of Abraham.

It is obvious that the story in ch. 20 bears some relation to the similar J account in 12:10-20.[7] In both, Sarah is passed off as Abraham's sister, in both she is taken into the harem of a foreign ruler, in both the household of the ruler is plagued as a result, and in both Abraham receives rich gifts from the ruler by way of compensation. The presence of these common features can scarcely be regarded as accidental. The problem is to determine the exact relationship between the two narratives.

One thing is certain: the E story is apologetic in character, softening the "harsher aspects of the story".[8] It endeavours to clear Abraham of any accusation of untruthfulness in passing off Sarah as his sister, asserting that she was indeed his sister, although only a half-sister.[9] It is obvious that the author of the E story was acquainted with the account in ch. 12 and that he assumed a knowledge of it on the part of his readers. The fact that he gave the incident a new setting and had a different king involved shows that he did not intend his version to be a substitute for the J story. He did not tamper with the J tradition, but by composing a story of a similar incident which is said to have taken place in the Negeb, he endeavoured to remove any basis for accusing Abraham of being a liar. As noted also, the fact that vs. 17 speaks of healing without any previous mention of the Deity plaguing the people can best be explained by suggesting that both writer and reader knew the story in 12:10-20. Further evidence of such a possibility will be noted below.

2. 21:1-21. The birth of Isaac and the second expulsion of Hagar.

(a) Vss. 1-7. The birth of Isaac. Critics are generally agreed that vs. 1a is a part of the J narrative, but they differ with regard to vs. 1b, some assigning it, in spite of the presence of the divine name YHWH, to E or P; others regard it as the work of a glossator (see App. D). There is no reason, however, to suspect the unity of the verse on stylistic grounds. It merely presents another example of parallelism in Hebrew prose. The desire of critics to discover two more or less complete strands has led them to see "doublets" where they do not exist. Since the name YHWH is used, it is likely that the verse is to be assigned to a J writer. The previous chapter was brought to a close with a reference to Sarah. Chapter 21 begins with a reference to Sarah. Thus, "Sarah" is the "Stichwort" which provides a connection between the two stories. It is suggested, therefore, that 21:1, like 20:18, should be assigned to the same writer.

Verse 2, like vs. 1, is also split up by the critics, with vs. 2a usually assigned to J and vs. 2b to P (see App. D). The verse, however, forms a logical unity and contains no trace of composite origin. Since the expression בן לזקניו also occurs in vs. 7, it is obvious that determining the author of vs. 7 will also be determinative for vs. 2.

Verses 3-5 are universally assigned to P (see App. D), because of the following features: (i) the divine name Elohim; (ii) the reference to circumcision (cf. 17:12--P); (iii) the chronological interest; (iv) the naming of the child by the father (vs. 3); (v) the correspondence of vs. 3 with 16:15 and 17:19 (both P). There is little reason to doubt that the section is by P.

Verses 6-7 are often regarded as having a composite origin (see App. D). Gunkel, for example, assigned vs. 6a to E, and vss. 6b-7 to J, since vs. 6a is felt to be a statement of joy at the birth of a child, while vss. 6b-7 refer to the unbelievable nature of the birth.[10] This assertion, as well as Skinner's view that all of vs. 6 is "an expression of joy",[11] are surely open to question. Nor is there any need to transpose vs. 6b after vs. 7, as Budde suggested.[12] Both verses point to the incredible nature of the birth, and both relate that Sarah expected to be laughed at, an emphasis which is slightly different from that in the J narrative in 18:10 ff. Since the name Elohim is used to designate God, vss. 6-7 are either P or E. Since there is no trace of P's characteristics, usually so evident, the verses are to be assigned to E, continuing the account begun in vs. 2, which is thus also to be assigned to E.

(b) Vss. 8-21. The second expulsion of Hagar. There is general agreement that this story is from E (see App. D), because of the occurrence of Elohim (vss. 12, 17, 17, 19, 20) and מלאך אלהים in vs. 17. It is also generally agreed that either P or a still later hand must have tampered with the text in vs. 14, changing it from an original ואת־הילד שם על־שכמה in order to avoid the absurdity of having Ishmael who, according to the chronology of P, must have been about 17 years of age, carried on the back of his mother. Simpson attempts to remove vss. 11-13 from the basic story since he believes that such theological reflection is too advanced for E's time.[13] This view presupposes an early date for the E material. This matter cannot be dealt with adequately at this time.

It is obvious that there is some relationship between the E story of Hagar's expulsion in 21:8-21 and the J story recorded in ch. 16. The chief characters are the same in both, viz., Abraham, Sarah, Hagar and her child. In both Hagar is driven out of Abraham's home and is found by an angel. In both it is foretold that the child will be the father of a great nation. For the correspondence of other smaller details in the two stories, see Gunkel's penetrating study.[14]

It is usually assumed that the E story is an attempt to re-write the J account in order to present Abraham in a better light. Thus in the E version a divine revelation is required before Abraham accedes to Sarah's request to drive out Hagar and her son. Furthermore, Abraham manifests his concern for their welfare by providing them with food and drink. Smend noted that the method here employed to re-tell a J story was similar to that discussed above in connection with ch. 20, "Auch diese Erzählung erweist sich in jeder Einzelheit als eine Umdichtung der jahvistischen Parallele von c 16, und fast in jeder Einzelheit ist die Umdichtung motiviert durch den moralischen und transzendentalen Monotheismus des Verfassers und den damit zusammenhängenden religiösen Anspruch Israels."[15] But this is not the whole of the matter. The question arises whether E presented only his own version of the expulsion story, or whether he may not have added his version to the J account, which contained the story in ch. 16. For ch. 21 to achieve its purpose, it was surely required that the previous story be known, otherwise "correction" was impossible. If he had intended his version only as a substitute for that of J, he would scarcely have altered the basic pattern so drastically. Thus, he has Hagar driven out after the birth of Ishmael, not during her pregnancy as in the J account in ch. 16. He also has Hagar remain in the desert with her son, whereas in ch. 16 it is stated that Hagar was commanded to go home. Any unfavorable impression which the readers may have formed on the basis of the J account was, therefore, placed in a new perspective. It would appear that E sought to rectify the older tradition by supplementation not substitution. This bears out the suggestions made above in connection with ch. 20.

3. 21:22-34. Abraham and Abimelech make a covenant at Beersheba.

There is considerable difference of opinion regarding the analysis of this story. Eissfeldt assigns the entire section to E, with only the name YHWH in vs. 33 being regarded as redactional.[16] Others agree in assigning the bulk of the narrative to E but believe that J or a late redactor is responsible for parts of vss. 32-34.[17]

Gunkel's treatment is more drastic. He believed it possible to separate two strands, Jb and E (see App. D) on the following grounds: (i) two covenants are consummated (vss. 27b and 32a); (ii) gifts are twice mentioned (vss. 27a and 28-30); (iii) vss. 25-26 interrupt the connection between vss. 22-24 and 27; (iv) two different traditions are given regarding the origin of the name Beersheba, one deriving it from the "oath" taken by Abraham and Abimelech (vss. 23, 24, 31), the other from the "seven" lambs given to Abimelech (vss. 28-30); (v) the use of the name Elohim in vss. 22-23 and YHWH in vs. 33.[18] The evidence adduced by Gunkel in favor of dual authorship appears to be impressive. However, his claim that two covenants are mentioned will not bear close scrutiny. Verse 32 merely states that after the covenant, mentioned in vs. 27, had been made, Abimelech and his general departed. His assertion that vss. 25-26 constitute a digression is a valid observation, but it does not necessarily follow that the dialogue is from another source. Abraham, before making the covenant with Abimelech, attempts to ascertain what sort of person he is. Is he the kind of man with whom one would care to make a covenant? Abraham does not forget about the well mentioned in vss. 25-26, but after the covenant has been made he pursues the matter further by insisting that Abimelech accept from him a gift of seven lambs as a visible token of his acknowledgement of Abraham's right to the well. Gunkel is right in maintaining that two traditions regarding the meaning of the name Beersheba are given. It is possible that two separate tales existed at the oral stage. The question is, does the presence of two etymologies prove the existence of two written sources? The usual assumption is that it does, and more than once the literary analysis of Genesis has been based on this assumption. There would seem, however, to be no inherent reason why an author, acquainted with more than one etymology, might not present both in order to suggest the full significance of the name, or because he was unable to choose between them. In the present instance, there is no reason for believing that more than one author is involved. He manifestly favors the interpretation "Well of the Oath" but the fact that he has taken the trouble to work into his narrative the reference to "seven" lambs shows that he was aware of the existence of another interpretation of the name, viz., "Well of Seven". Further traditional material dealing with the well is to be found in 26:13-22 and will be discussed below.

The transition to the use of the divine name YHWH in vs. 33 suggests that this verse is not of E authorship. It is significant that the change in divine name occurs in connection with the introduction of a new element in the narrative, the planting of a tamarisk tree by Abraham at Beersheba. The statement that Abraham worshipped YHWH at Beersheba under the name of El, in this case El-'olam, is reminiscent of the mention of El-roi in 16:13, where the attempt to equate YHWH with an El deity was briefly discussed.

Verse 34 can hardly be from E because vs. 32 reported that Abimelech returned to the land of the Philistines, presumably leaving Abraham at Beersheba. Eissfeldt's attempt to retain it for E by shifting it after 20:17[19] is too drastic a move. It seems probable that vs. 34, like vs. 33, is the work of a writer who seems to have thought of Abraham as moving away from Beersheba after the incident recorded in 21:22-32 and returning to the Gerar area in the land of the Philistines where he sojourned for "many days". The latter statement may have been intended to allow time for Isaac to grow up sufficiently to play the role assigned to him in ch. 22.

To sum up, the story of the covenant made by Abraham and Abimelech at Beersheba constitutes a solid block of E material, with the exception of vss. 33-34 which are secondary additions.

4. 22:1-19. The test of Abraham's faith.

There is almost universal agreement that vss. 1-13 and 19 are the work of E and that vss. 15-18 are a later addition. In regard to vs. 14 opinions vary, some attributing it to E, some viewing it as secondary (see App. D).

There can be no doubt concerning the literary unity of vss. 1-13. They constitute one of the masterpieces of Hebrew literature, with each verse contributing an essential element. The use of Elohim (vss. 8, 12), and האלהים (vss. 1, 3, 9) points to E authorship. The only problem presented by this section is the occurrence of the expression מלאך יהוה in vs. 11. In view of E's use of the term מלאך אלהים for the agent of revelation (see 21:17) it may be safely assumed that this was the original reading here as well. The change to מלאך יהוה was doubtless made by a writer who wished to use this term in vs. 15 (see below).

Although most critics take vs. 14 as the conclusion of the section which begins with vs. 1 and assign it to E (see App. D), the presence of a place-name compounded of YHWH and the reference to the "mountain of YHWH" strongly suggest that this verse is not from E. In 16:13-14, a later hand associated the origin of the place-name Beer-lahai-roi with a revelation of the angel of YHWH. In 22:14 another instance of the same kind is to be seen, making it probable that the verse is also by a later writer. The purpose behind the mention of the name at this point in his story is not immediately clear. He draws attention to the fact that the second element of the name, viz., יִרְאֶה , was later changed to יֵרָאֶה . This change is reminiscent of the ancient law in Ex. 23:15, ולא־יראה פני ריקם , where the original text must surely have been יִרְאֶה . The change to יֵרָאֶה was doubtless made to avoid the suggestion that YHWH could be seen. After the publication of Deuteronomy, the law in Ex. 23:15 was likely interpreted as referring to seeing YHWH's face at Jerusalem. Therefore, Gen. 22:14 would seem to be a hint that the spot where Abraham's faith was tested and which he called יהוה יראה was located at Jerusalem. The further reference to the "mountain of YHWH" converts the hint into an open avowal. There is nothing in vss. 1-13 to support this identification. According to vs. 4, the spot could be seen from afar as Abraham and his party approached, but it is impossible to see the temple hill when approaching Jerusalem from the south. It is likely that the original tradition thought of the "land of Moriah" as somewhere south of Gerar or south of Beersheba (see 21:33-34). Later its location may have been forgotten, enabling a later writer to adapt the story to his purposes without difficulty. The identification of Moriah with the temple hill at Jerusalem, which appears in II Chron. 3:1, thus goes back at least to the time of the writer responsible for 22:14.

Verses 15-18 are not part of the E story as may be seen from the use of the divine name YHWH (vss. 15, 16). Eissfeldt attempts to retain the verses for E, but is forced to suggest that the divine name must have been changed (see App. D). It is clear, however, that these verses are dependent upon the preceding story. The angel calls out "a second time", while vs. 16 refers to חשך and יחידך , which were significant terms in the preceding verses (see vss. 2 and 12). The purpose of this section is to add to the promises previously made to Abraham by YHWH. It has been suggested above that the promises in 12:2-3 and 16:10 are secondary. Since 22:15-18 are plainly intrusive, both thematically and from a purely literary point of view, the provisional statements regarding the secondary nature of 12:2-3 seem to be confirmed. It would appear as if both sets of promises may be assigned to the same hand.

Verse 19 is closely tied in with vs. 5 and may, therefore, be assigned to the same author, E. It appears to have been the original sequel to vs. 13.

22:20-24. The descendants of Nahor.

Some critics assign this genealogy to J, while others regard it as the work of a later hand (see App. D). It was manifestly included at this point to prepare the way for ch. 24 in which Nahor, Bethuel and

Rebekah (who are listed in the genealogy) play important roles. Since ch. 23 is the work of P, as all critics admit (see below), 22:20-24 will originally have preceded ch. 24 with no material intervening. Final judgment must be reserved until ch. 24 has been considered.

A consideration of the E source in the light of chs. 20-22.

The examination of chs. 20-22 has revealed that the four episodes in the life of Abraham, which these chapters contain, are excerpts from an E source. It has been suggested above that these episodes did not form a continuous sequence in E. In favour of such a view is the fact that according to the present sequence, Isaac's birth (ch. 21) must have taken place in the vicinity of Gerar, not at Hebron as is presupposed in 18:10 ff. Furthermore, while Abimelech has been mentioned in ch. 20, the third episode (21:22-32) is introduced in an abrupt manner. Nor is there any mention of Abraham's move to Beersheba where the third episode has its setting. In other words, it must be assumed that a later editor selected only certain of the stories which he found in E.

In reviewing chs. 20-21 one is not impressed by E's ability as a story-teller. His stories are pale reflections of those of J. Two of them (20:1-17 and 21:2, 6-21) seem to be compositions of his own, intended to rectify the unsatisfactory picture of Abraham given by J. If these narratives are typical of E's work, one can only call him notably lacking in originality. The opinion of Volz that "Es hat nie einen zweiten originalen Erzähler in der Genesis gegeben, aber es hat zu irgendeiner Zeit einen Umdichter gegeben, der das ihm vorliegende Werk des Jahwisten da und dort umgedichtet hat",[20] would seem to be well founded.

The chief objection to such a view would seem to be the exceptionally high literary and dramatic quality of the fourth story, the test of Abraham's faith. If it is an original composition by E, then the impression gained from studying his accounts in chs. 20-21 requires modification. On the other hand, it has been felt by a number of critics that ch. 22 bears the imprint of J, and there have been numerous attempts to explain away the use of Elohim in order to attribute it to J.[21] Actually there is no need for such drastic measures. It has been pointed out above that E must have incorporated the J stories in order for his own accounts to achieve their purpose, i.e., to correct the impression left by the former. There is no good reason why he may not have incorporated other traditions as well. While it is obvious that the J narrative must have contained an account of the birth of Isaac in order to fulfil the promise made to Sarah in 18:10-15, there is no indication that the test of Abraham's faith was ever part of the J story. If E's date is later than that of J, it is surely possible that during the interval other traditions had arisen which E saw fit to include.

In view of this possibility, it is uncertain whether or not E's third episode, the covenant between Abraham and Abimelech (21:22-32), had a basis in the J narrative. The fact that the story does not seem to be apologetic in character might suggest that E derived it from J. This would imply that in J Abraham was not represented as maintaining a fixed residence at Hebron, but as moving as far south as Beersheba. There has been no indication to date that such was the case. It is also significant that Isaac is connected with both Abimelech and Beersheba in ch. 26 (see below). It is more likely, therefore, that this episode, like ch. 22:1-13, 19, was taken over by E from a source other than J, and incorporated into his Life of Abraham.

In conclusion, a word is in order regarding the provenance and date of this E material. It is customary to regard E as a product of the Northern Kingdom and to date it about 750 B.C., i.e., not long before the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 721 B.C. The view that E is of northern origin rests largely on the assumption that the E Abraham material is by the same author as the basic E Joseph Story, but this is an assumption which begs the question, since the theory that E is a continuous document running through all of Genesis and even beyond, is far from proven. The emphasis on the Negeb in chs. 20-22 may point rather to southern origin, but it must be admitted that merely because E records traditions from the South does not prove he was a Southerner. It is, therefore, impossible to make a definitive statement regarding the provenance of E.

As far as the date of the E account in the Abraham Story is concerned, little direct evidence has been discovered. Attention may be drawn again to the reference to Abraham as a prophet (20:7) and the broaching of the question of indiscriminate punishment in 20:4 (a subject of some interest at the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel). Smend's comment on ch. 20 is also pertinent in this connection; he stated: "Auf allen diesen Punkten ist die ältere Erzählung von $12^{10\text{ ff.}}$ in c 20 umgedichtet im Interesse des moralischen Monotheismus und der religiösen Würde Israels."[22] A full investigation of the activity of E would involve a study of the remainder of the Pentateuch. This is manifestly outside the scope of the present thesis. As a result of the study of chs. 20-22 it must be admitted that the evidence concerning both the provenance and date of the E material is insufficient to make any definite judgment.

NOTES ON CHAPTER VI

[1] Documentary Hypothesis, p. 40.

[2] ETI, pp. 80-81.

[3] Cf. Albright's ingenious but unconvincing translation in BASOR, 163 (1961), p. 48.

[4] Holzinger, Genesis, p. 160.

[5] Die Genesis, p. 306.

[6] C. J. Bredenkamp, "Zu Gen. 20, 17. 18," Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben, III (1882), pp. 671-672.

[7] The relationship of this story to the account in ch. 26 will be examined below.

[8] Skinner, Genesis, p. 315.

[9] The genealogy in 11:27-32, however, gives absolutely no support to E's claim.

[10] Genesis, p. 227.

[11] Genesis, p. 321.

[12] Biblische Urgeschichte, p. 224; cf. Holzinger, Genesis, p. 161.

[13] ETI, p. 81.

[14] Genesis, pp. 231-232.

[15] Smend, Die Erzählung, p. 40.

[16] HS, pp. 35* and 259*.

[17] Cf. Dillmann, Die Genesis, pp. 287-289, and Holzinger, Genesis, p. 162.

[18] Genesis, p. 233.

[19] HS, p. 259*.

[20] Der Elohist als Erzähler, p. 35.

[21] Ibid., pp. 40-47. This view has been advocated most recently by Speiser, Genesis, p. 166.

[22] Die Erzählung, p. 39.

VII GENESIS 14

At least two elements have been woven together in this chapter resulting in a story which has baffled critics to this day. A tradition about a campaign undertaken by four eastern kings against five petty rulers of the Dead Sea region (vss. 1-12) has been incorporated into the Abraham Story by having it affect Abraham and his nephew Lot. On Abraham's return from pursuing the invaders, he meets Melchizedek the priest-king of Salem (vss. 13-24) and pays his respects to the latter's god, El-'elyon. While these major divisions are obvious, there is little agreement concerning the relationship of either of the two episodes to one another, or of the chapter as a whole to the rest of Genesis.

Earlier critics attempted to relate the chapter to one of the main strata of the Pentateuch. Delitzsch, for example, argued for J authorship, pointing to the use of יהוה (vs. 22) and אלני ממרא (vs. 13).[1] Dillmann attempted to show that the episode could not be the work of J because: (i) יהוה in vs. 22 is redactional; (ii) עמק השדים rather than ככר הירדן is used (cf. 13:10 ff.); (iii) there is no mention of this story in chs. 18-19; (iv) J does not elsewhere refer to Admah and Zeboiim. Dillmann gathered the evidence for P (רכוש , רכש), and for E (בלעדי and האמרי), and then proceeded to use this evidence to disprove the connection with any of the recognized documents in Genesis. He suggested that three stages could be detected in the development of the story: (a) a vague ancient tradition of a battle between some eastern kings and the Pentapolis; (b) the adding of the names; (c) the addition of the Melchizedek incident.[2] Driver assigned the chapter to a "Special Source", which he felt could not be earlier than Ezekiel or the exile.[3] Eissfeldt has endeavoured to demonstrate that it is related to P, with numerous glosses (see App. D).

It is generally agreed that this chapter is "an isolated boulder in the stratification of the Pent.,"[4] "ein sehr wichtiges Beispiel der Nachtragung einer ganzen Erzählung in die fertige Genesis."[5] In recent years there has been a tendency to suggest that ancient material is to be found in it. Pfeiffer, for example, assigned the chapter to his S source, with the Melchizedek incident being a late midrash by S2.[6] Lewy feels that the chapter is the work of Nathan, the tenth century master narrator.[7] Noth well sums up the current situation with respect to the chapter when he says, "Die Frage der Quellenzugehörigkeit von Gen. 14 ist nach wie vor völlig dunkel."[8]

Vss. 1-12. The war with the monarchs of the East.

Critics have devoted most of their attention in recent years to a discussion of the wealth of comparative material which has come to light in the Near East. While this is of great importance, it contributes nothing directly to the solution of the literary problems involved.[9] The detailed study of the chapter by Nöldeke, resulting in the conclusion that while the kernel of the story may be historical, the present narrative is pure fiction,[10] cannot easily be brushed aside by the fact that names and customs mentioned in this chapter could fit a second millenium B.C. milieu in the ancient Near East. In view of the constant misrepresentation of the problem by scholars, it is pertinent to recall Wellhausen's observation, "Wenn das Subjekt nicht existirt, so fällt die Aussage von selber, das ist wahr. Aber man darf die Sache nicht umkehren und aus der Wirklichkeit des Subjekts auf die Richtigkeit der Aussage schliessen."[11] Therefore, while the question of whether or not the people and places mentioned are in keeping with a second millenium setting is a legitimate subject for investigation, it is one which is only secondarily related to the literary analysis of the chapter. The purpose of the story in its present form and in its present position is the basic point to be investigated.

The episode does not fit as poorly into the overall story of Abraham as has sometimes been supposed. According to 13:10 ff. Abraham was a man of considerable means, so much so that he and Lot had to separate. This is surely in harmony with the picture presented in ch. 14, where he has a considerable body of followers at his disposal. The story is also not the first example of an encounter between Abraham and foreign rulers, as the meeting with Pharaoh in ch. 12 attests. Lot and the cities of the *kikkar* are still in existence in ch. 14, hence it is essential that the story be worked into the cycle of tales before chs. 18-19. Finally, Abraham's refusal to accept a reward is not only a glorification of his character; it also sets the stage for ch. 15 which tells of the real reward which YHWH promised him.

Vss. 13-24. *Abraham's heroic efforts and his meeting with Melchizedek.*

The introduction of Abraham and the account of his epochal victory (vss. 13 ff.) appears to be a new element in the story. It is surely strange that he was not aware of a large-scale invasion only a few miles from his home. It is also quite improbable that three hundred and eighteen men could put to rout a large foreign army. While Abraham's military exploits appear to be legendary, there is no doubt that his actions mark the climax of the story as far as the writer of the chapter is concerned. "It is obvious that the first half is merely introductory, and that the purpose of the whole is to illustrate the singular dignity of Abram's position among the potentates of the earth."[12]

Although often regarded as an interpolation,[13] the meeting between Abraham and Melchizedek is the most significant incident in the entire story in its present form. It is scarcely true that this encounter interrupts the flow of the story. Although the king of Sodom goes out to meet Abraham (vs. 17), no conversation results. The meeting with Melchizedek takes place before Abraham and the king of Sodom can discuss the return of the captured property. It should be noted that in vs. 22 *El-'elyon*, who was introduced in vs. 19, is identified with YHWH, and the expression קנה שמים וארץ (vs. 19) is repeated. Thus, there is a conscious attempt to weave vss. 18-20 into the context. The meeting with the king of Salem provides the setting for Abraham's assertion that he will not share in the spoils of battle. Verses 18-20 may, therefore, be considered an integral part of the original story.

Since Melchizedek is one of the key figures in this part of ch. 14, it is imperative that the full significance of his role be determined. One of the crucial problems in this connection is the location of Salem. The only other reference to it in the Old Testament mentions it in parallelism with Zion (Psalm 76:3), making it obvious that the Psalmist was referring to Jerusalem. Since Psalm 110 connects Melchizedek with Zion and the throne, this identification is further strengthened. It is interesting that *1Q Gen. Apoc*. xxii, 13, makes this identification explicit (ואתה לשלם היא ירושלם).

If Jerusalem is intended, the question arises why the author desired to associate Abraham with the city. The writer is careful not to contradict the facts of history, according to which Jerusalem did not become Hebrew property until the time of David; hence he does not have Abraham enter the city. Rather, the priest of Jerusalem comes out and meets him outside its walls. But why was this important to the writer? Nyberg has suggested that the story was related to give stronger support to David's claim to Jerusalem as his new capital.[14] Von Rad accepts this view in principle but stresses that the tale is specifically intended to dispel the misgivings of "der patriarchalisch gläubigen Landbevölkerung" who were not ready to give their allegiance to the new king of a once Canaanite city state.[15] Herbert Schmid has rightly pointed out the weaknesses in such theories, noting that David's claim to Jerusalem was made legitimate by the story of YHWH's destroying messenger (II Sam. 24:16 ff.) and above all by the transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem (II Sam. 6).[16]

H. H. Rowley rejects any direct connection between David and Gen. 14, but suggests that both this story and Psalm 110 emphasize the legitimacy of the priesthood of Zadok, whom Rowley regards as "the pre-Davidic priest in Jerusalem."[17] Rowley suggests that Psalm 110:4 is David's statement to Zadok conferring on him an everlasting right to the priesthood.[18] To make the evidence fit, Rowley is forced to de-emphasize the "kingly" function of Melchizedek, which he feels is lacking in Gen. 14 (despite the explicit reference to him as מלך שלם in vs. 18), and to stress the priestly aspect of both this chapter and Psalm 110. The further weaknesses in Rowley's theory are the lack of any evidence for vss. 1-3 and vs. 4 of Psalm 110 ever having been directed to different individuals, as well as the fact that David is said to have exercised priestly functions himself.[19]

Even if one were to concede that Psalm 110 is related to David's assumption of power in Jerusalem, there is little direct connection between the Psalm and Gen. 14. The name Melchizedek is mentioned in both compositions, and it is likely that the setting of both is Jerusalem, but there is no reference to *El-'elyon* in Psalm 110, nor is the epithet קנה שמים וארץ to be found. It would appear possible, then, for the writer of Gen. 14 to be drawing on some Jerusalem tradition involving a priest-king named Melchizedek, without any direct reliance upon Psalm 110. The purpose for which Melchizedek is introduced in Gen. 14 is quite possibly far removed from that in Psalm 110.

There are several expressions in the chapter which are usually regarded as characteristic of P. These are: (i) the noun רכוש in vss. 11, 12, 16, 21; (ii) יליד בית (vs. 14; elsewhere in Gen. 17:12, 13, 23, 27; Lev. 22:11); (iii) נפש in the sense of "person" (vs. 21; cf. 12:4 and App. C). The presence of these expressions might suggest that the story has been glossed by P. It is impossible, however, to lift words or entire sentences and attribute them to P without marring the narrative. A much more natural explanation is that the author of the chapter shared certain characteristic marks with P and should perhaps be dated not long before P.[20]

The "*annalistic* official style"[21] which some commentators have observed in vss. 1-12 suggests that the author of ch. 14 may have utilized a written source for this part of his narrative. If so, he seems to have re-cast it in some measure, which can account for the presence of expressions used elsewhere in late sources. Verses 13 ff. give less evidence of previous formulation, and appear to be more the work of the writer's ingenuity, although it is possible that the Melchizedek tradition was not an invention on his part but was based on some tradition current in his day.

It is readily admitted that any proposed solution to the literary growth of this difficult chapter must be tentative. Ancient material appears to have been re-cast at a relatively late date, with the writer attempting to incorporate an important battle into Abraham's life, thus placing him in world affairs. The character of Abraham is also enhanced through his refusal to accept a reward. Abraham's connection with Jerusalem is also attempted in this chapter, although it is not emphasized. The implications of these general comments will be examined in a concluding chapter.

For the present this chapter may be designated as X.

NOTES ON CHAPTER VII

[1] Genesis, p. 261.

[2] Die Genesis, pp. 233-235.

[3] Genesis, p. 155.

[4] Skinner, Genesis, p. 256.

[5] Wellhausen, Die Composition, p. 311.

[6] Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 160.

[7] The Growth of the Pentateuch, pp. 188-191.

[8] ÜP, p. 29.

[9] A few pertinent articles are: J. Meinhold, I. Mose 14, BZAW, XXII (1911); W. F. Albright, "The historical background of Gen. 14," Journal of the Society of Oriental Research, X (1926), pp. 231-269; R. de Vaux, "Les patriarches Hébreux et les découvertes modernes," RB, LIII (1946), pp. 321-348; ibid., LV (1948), pp. 321-347; ibid., LVI (1949), pp. 5-36; H. H. Rowley, "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age," BJRL, XXXII (1949), pp. 3-38; M. Noth, "Arioch-Arriwuk," VT, I (1951), pp. 136-140; Kurt Jaritz, "Wer ist Amraphel in Genesis 14?" ZAW, LXX (1958), pp. 255-256; F. Cornelius, "Genesis XIV," ZAW, LXXII (1960), pp. 1-7. A basic evaluation of the limitations of archaeology for historical reconstruction is M. Noth, "Der Beitrag der Archäologie zur Geschichte Israels," VT, Supp. VII (1960), pp. 262-282.

[10] Part III of Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments (Kiel: Schwers'sche Buchhandlung, 1869); cf. also Driver, Genesis, pp. 171-173.

[11] Die Composition, p. 312.

[12] Skinner, Genesis, p. 255.

[13] E.g. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 285.

[14] "Studien zum Religionskampf im AT," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, XXXV (1938), pp. 329-387.

[15] Genesis, ATD, p. 152.

[16] "Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem," ZAW, LXVII (1955), p. 177.

[17] "Melchizedek and Zadok (Gen 14 and Ps 110)," Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet, eds. W. Baumgartner et al. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1950), pp. 461-472.

[18] Ibid., p. 470.

[19] Cf. the criticisms by H. J. Kraus, Psalmen, BKAT, p. 760.

[20] While accepting the historical reliability of the bulk of this chapter, Speiser calls the equation of YHWH with El-'elyon a "late reflex". Genesis, p. 109.

[21] Skinner, Genesis, p. 256.

VIII GENESIS 15

This chapter relates two divine promises made to Abraham: (i) the promise of an heir (vss. 1-6), and (ii) the promise of a land, the latter being made at a solemn covenant ceremony (vss. 7-21). Wellhausen noted several inconsistencies within the chapter which led him to suggest that the promise of an heir (vss. 1-6) was basically an E narrative which had been rewritten by R^{JE}, while the promise of the land (vss. 7 ff.) was basically J, although also re-cast by a redactor. Verses 7, 13-16, 19-21 he regarded as secondary, with vss. 7, 13-16 exhibiting signs of P authorship.[1]

Gunkel, following Dillmann and others, gathered all the evidence for considering the chapter as composite. He did not follow Wellhausen, however, in dividing the chapter into the two major sections noted above. His solution lay in attempting to isolate two accounts, J and E, which he felt were very similar, and which ran through most of the chapter. Bits and pieces from one or the other were supposedly chosen by a redactor, but some doublets remain.[2] Gunkel's approach has gained the following of a considerable number of critics.[3]

Skinner took note of the inconsistencies pointed out by Gunkel, but felt that the solution lay in a different direction. He favored late J authorship of the story, based on an E account, but the presence of marked Deuteronomic influence prevented him from assigning the story to either of his J strands. Skinner readily admitted that such a theory was so complex and so different from the method observed elsewhere in Genesis that it could not be defended with any confidence.[4]

Simpson noted the failure of scholars to reach any agreement on the analysis of ch. 15 and suggested that "the chapter is late material throughout, and that it is the result of one or more elaborations of a much simpler story."[5]

Other scholars have sought the solution to the problems in an entirely different manner. Thorough attempts to work out alternative methods have been suggested by W. Staerk,[6] and Paul Volz,[7] who have rejected the general methodology of literary analysis. They have pointed instead to the original separate origin of vss. 1-6 and 7-21. In recent years several other studies have been made which contribute to a better understanding of the chapter. Otto Kaiser has attempted to trace the origins of the traditions recorded in the narrative as well as the use to which these stories were put in later Israel,[8] while the significance of the covenant in ch. 15 has been the chief concern of a study by L. A. Snijders.[9] The work of these critics will be discussed more fully below.

This brief survey of previous criticism of ch. 15 makes it clear that there is no one critical view which predominates. The most that can be said by way of generalized survey is that two views appear to have emerged regarding the composition of the chapter. Some critics stress the unity of vss. 1-6 on the one hand, and of at least the nucleus of vss. 7-21 on the other, but they do so on the assumption that the two sections were not originally related (e.g. Eerdmans, Staerk, Volz, Kaiser, Simpson). Others accept the approach of Gunkel, who felt that vss. 1-6 comprise such a small unit that it is unlikely that it ever existed independently, hence parallel stories probably ran throughout the entire chapter.[10]

The chapter will be examined in its present order in an attempt to determine its relationship to sources previously encountered in the course of this study.

Vs. 1. Abraham's vision.

This verse is often split up by critics, with a few words assigned to E and the bulk to J (see App. D). The chief reasons for such a division are:

(i) The use of the divine name YHWH in 1a would favor J authorship, but there are said to be two signs of E, viz.: במחזה and אחר הדברים האלה . The expression "after these things" has been noted above in connection with 22:1, 20 (used with ויהי), where this expression, as well as ויהי בעת ההוא (21:22) may have been used as a formula by the writer to introduce the excerpts from his source which he was thus incorporating into the narrative. The expression מחזה

is found elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Numbers 24:4, 16; Ez. 13:7, and is, therefore, not an indication of E authorship. It is true that מחזה as well as ... היה דבר־יהוה have conceptual affinities with prophetic literature,[11] and this calls to mind the representation of Abraham as a prophet in E (20:1-17), but it has been noted that Abraham was represented in similar terms in 18:17 ff. Thus the reasons suggested for assigning part of the verse to E are insufficient.

(ii) Verse 1b is said to be composed of doublets and is, therefore, often divided between J and E (see App. D).[12] There is no reason to question the unity of vs. 1b. Kaiser has demonstrated that this half-verse is a typical "Heilsorakel", and that the various parts are complementary, not contradictory.[13] If this segment grew out of "Kriegsideologie"[14] a significant link with ch. 14 in which Abraham's military prowess was related might be suggested.[15]

A further connection with ch. 14 has also been seen. Jeremias translated אנכי מגן לך by "Ich will dir deinen Lohn geben", as a parallel to שכרך הרבה מאד , establishing a possible link with 14:20 where מגן obviously means "to deliver, hand over".[16]

Whether or not Jeremias' suggestion is accepted, a marked connection with ch. 14 is established by the promise of a reward to Abraham (vs. 1b). In ch. 14 Abraham refused to accept any reward (cf. 14:22 ff.); here YHWH promises a better reward than Abraham could have imagined. It would thus appear possible to attribute 15:1 to the writer responsible for ch. 14 and apparently also responsible for the present order of the events in Abraham's life.

Vss. 2-6. A son promised to Abraham.

The following reasons have been advanced for regarding these verses as composite: (i) Verse 3a repeats the thought of vs. 2a; furthermore, ויאמר אברם is used in each of the doublets; (ii) Verse 5 obviously takes place at night, while in vs. 17 the sun is just setting; hence vs. 5 is assigned to E and vs. 17 to J. The expression זרעך (vs. 5) answers the complaint of vs. 3a (E), while vs. 4 (J) by means of the term ירש answers the complaint of vs. 3b (J).[17]

The unity of these verses hinges primarily on whether or not vss. 2 and 3 are doublets. There is no doubt that vs. 2b is difficult, with some textual corruption or attempt at glossing being at least possible. Numerous ingenious attempts have been made to solve this crux, but few have gained acceptance. It seems likely that some attempt has been made to prefigure the difficulties which the Hebrews had with Damascus.[18] Whether or not the name Eliezer is original here is also uncertain. If he is the same person as המשל בכל־אשר־לו of 24:2, it is not made explicit, cf. זקן ביתו (24:2), בן־משק ביתי (15:2), and בן־ביתי (15:3). The possibility of a textual change from לא זרעי to אליעזר has been suggested, the name Eliezer thus being an artificial concoction. It has also been suggested that the name was concocted to arrive at one whose numerical value was 318; this being the number of men who assisted Abraham in ch. 14.[19] It would, however, seem more likely that the number in ch. 14 was derived from the name Eliezer, rather than the reverse.

There is no doubt that vss. 2 and 3 appear repetitious. Yet, since the situation portrayed is crucial for the success of Abraham, it is quite possible that in his anxiety or disbelief, he is made to stress the severity of the condition. Staerk comments, "Die Doppelung der schmerzlich-resignierten Frage Abrahams v. 2 u. 3 aber lässt sich aus der Kunstform der Erzählung als psychologisch begründete Feinheit der Darstellung verstehen . . . wo ist der verheissene Sohn, der Träger und Garant der Erfüllung des Gotteswortes vom Segensstrom, der von Abraham über die Menschheit ausgehen soll?"[20] It is impossible to separate vss. 1-2 since vs. 2 is the direct reply to the promise in vs. 1. It is vs. 3 which appears to fit poorly. If there is further evidence in this chapter pointing to dual authorship, it may be that this solution ought to be sought here as well. In the absence of such evidence, it must be admitted that vss. 2-3 defy simple solution. The remaining verses flow smoothly. Verse 5 follows naturally after vs. 4 and would only be considered a doublet if one's theory demanded that a parallel be discovered.

It is significant that several expressions in these verses suggest Deuteronomic influence. Skinner noted the following: (i) the prophetic character of the communication to Abraham (vss. 1, 4); (ii) אדני יהוה (vs. 2, cf. Deut. 3:24; 9:26); (iii) the theological reflection on Abraham's righteousness (vs. 6).[21] Kaiser has added to this list the connection between the promise of descendants as numerous as the stars and Deut. 10:22.[22] It should be recalled that Deuteronomic influence has been seen in material examined previously (cf. above on 18:19).

Of great significance is the promise of numerous descendants in vs. 5. The scheme of promises to the Patriarchs will be studied later when all the references have been analyzed. It is sufficient at this time to draw attention to the marked similarity between 15:5 and the passage in 22:17: והרבה ארבה את־זרעך ככוכבי השמים (see also 26:4, below). The similarities and relationships among the various promises have been studied in detail by J. Hoftijzer, who concludes that a common origin for these promises is to be sought, with Gen. 15 being the central passage of the group.[23] Note also the use of יהוה (vss. 2, 4, 6), suggesting that this material is the work of a J writer. It is possible that he is incorporating more than one tradition (see above on vs. 2), hence it is only natural that some duplication and redundancy is to be found.

Vss. 7-17. The promise of a land.

These verses relating the covenant ceremony are often held to be composite, some of them fitting poorly following the preceding section (see App. D). Reasons which have been put forth for this view are: (i) YHWH is introduced in vs. 7, yet according to vs. 2 he was already known to Abraham; (ii) Abraham's doubt (vs. 8) is inconsistent with his faith previously noted (vs. 6); (iii) the approaching sunset (vs. 12) and the setting of the sun (vs. 17) are inconsistent with the previous scene in which the stars are shining (vs. 5); (iv) verse 12 contains doublets (נפלה, נפלת), also, if a תרדמה had fallen upon Abraham he would not have been conscious of subsequent events in which he participates.[24]

In approaching this section most critics have assumed that the covenant ceremony was originally independent of the promise in vss. 1-6. Such an assumption is difficult to defend on closer examination. Verse 7 begins with the words ויאמר אליו making it clear that some antecedent is required. Gunkel attempted to get around this difficulty by calling vs. 7 a redactional link, but since vs. 8 follows logically after vs. 7, it too must be secondary.[25] When these verses have been removed, the ceremony begun in vs. 9 is without point; hence it is assumed by critics that vss. 7-8 replace an introduction which was very similar.[26] Such reasoning begs the question. YHWH is not re-introduced in vs. 7, he is merely addressed by Abraham. Abraham's request for a sign is not a result of disbelief, but a fitting setting for the covenant ceremony in the following verses. Verses 7 and 8 bear significant similarities to the verses studied above, pointing to the probability that vss. 1-8, at least, are by the same writer. Thus the verb ירש, used in vss. 3 and 4, is picked up in vss. 7 and 8. The expression אדני יהוה (vs. 8) occurs in vs. 2, pointing again to a single author for the verses in question. It is, therefore, not surprising that Deuteronomic phraseology is evident in vss. 7-8, e.g. לתת ... לרשתה (vs. 7), noted by Skinner,[27] and אני יהוה אשר הוצאתיך (vs. 7), noted by Kaiser.[28] The use of the divine name YHWH, as well as the place-name אור כשדים (cf. 11:28, 31), in addition to the evidence noted above, makes it virtually certain that vss. 7-8 are also the work of a J writer.

Verses 9-12 record a covenant ceremony, which may be based on an old tradition, although the similarity between it and the ceremony described in Jeremiah 34:18-19 is a warning against any dogmatic attempt to date the story too early. The supposed doublets in vs. 12 have given many critics trouble (see App. D). Surely the same writer could use the same root twice, especially when one example is a Perfect and the other a Participle. The assumption that חשכה גדלה is a gloss originally placed after עלטה (vs. 17), but now misplaced,[29] is only plausible if vss. 13-16 are held to be secondary. The point of vs. 12 is that a supernatural experience is taking place, with mortal man excluded from active participation; cf. the similar use of תרדמה in Gen. 2:21. The dread, darkness, unconsciousness, all contribute to this awesome picture. The covenant is consummated "when the sun had gone down" (vs. 17) amid more mysterious happenings.

It would appear that vss. 9-12, 17, at least, represent a story which may have been taken over by a later writer and incorporated at this point. On the other hand, it is not as inconsistent with what precedes as is sometimes assumed. For example, the detection of apparent inconsistency in the night/dusk scenes (vss. 5, 12, 17) is simply an example of hypercriticism. If there is a discrepancy in the time-setting of the two incidents, it is due to the requirements of the promises. Mention of seed as numerous as the stars requires that the stars be visible. It is doubtful if the writer was conscious of this discrepancy. In any case, the story would be less dramatic if the first promise (vss. 1-6) were placed after the covenant ceremony, which forms the climax.

Critics have suggested that vss. 13-16 fit poorly in their present context and should be regarded as secondary or as the work of E, with many later glosses (see App. D). The evidence for connecting this section with E is the expression האמרי (vs. 16),[30] and the fact that the Amorites are singled out for mention in vs. 16, while later on, in vss. 19-21, they appear as one of the ten tribes in a J list.[31] Wellhausen argued that vss. 13-16 anticipate the promise made in vss. 17-18, hence they should be assigned to a redactor.[32] These arguments are not fully convincing. The expression אמרי is no sign of E, since it is found in Genesis in passages often assigned by critics to non-E hands (cf. 10:16; 14:7, 13; and also 48:22). It would appear as if "Amorite" is used here as a comprehensive term to designate the native inhabitants of the land. Wellhausen's point is also inconclusive. If, as has been shown above, the chapter is a unity thus far at least, promises have been basic to the entire narrative. While it is true that vss. 13-16 interrupt the covenant ceremony, may not this digression be the means of glorifying Abraham's future all the more by drawing attention to the experiences of his descendants? Furthermore, the promise of ultimate good fortune is made just before the covenant is finally sealed. In the light of the narrative studied up to this point there is no good reason for assigning the material to more than a single writer. The presence of some expressions regarded as characteristic of P should be noted; e.g. רכש (vs. 14, cf. 12:5); בשיבה טובה (vs. 15, cf. 25:8). A similar situation was noted in ch. 14. This may point to later annotation by P, but if, as has been suggested above, the writer dates from a time not far removed from that of P, it is entirely possible that he employs some of the same vocabulary as P.

Vss. 18-21. The boundaries of the promised land.

Gunkel and Procksch have assigned vss. 18b-21 to a later hand, vs. 18a being the conclusion to the J story. Others have attempted to divide the verses between J and E (see App. D). The purpose of these verses is clearly to spell out ideal boundaries and limits for the land promised to Abraham. Snijders has pointed out that of the ten peoples listed, the first three are found nowhere else in identical series, while the last seven correspond to several similar groupings elsewhere. On this basis, he suggests that two separate traditions have been drawn together at this point.[33]

The above analysis of the separate sections has disclosed no grounds for doubting the literary unity of the chapter and has shown that it, like ch. 14, may most naturally be regarded as the work of a later J writer. As a result of his desire to incorporate traditional material and at the same time compose relevant narrative, the literary style often is not as smooth as one would expect to find in material which has passed through a long stage of oral transmission, as may be seen in the material assigned elsewhere to J.

Chapter 15 is to be regarded as X material.

NOTES ON CHAPTER VIII

[1] *Die Composition*, pp. 21-22.

[2] *Genesis*, p. 177.

[3] Smend, *Die Erzählung*, pp. 43-45; Eichrodt, *BZAW*, XXXI (1916), pp. 62-65; Noth, *ÜP*, p. 29; see also App. D.

[4] *Genesis*, p. 277.

[5] *ETI*, p. 73.

[6] "Zur alttestamentlichen Literarkritik," *ZAW*, XLII (1924), pp. 34-74; esp. pp. 58 ff.

[7] *BZAW*, LXIII (1933), pp. 25-34.

[8] "Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Genesis 15," *ZAW*, LXX (1958), pp. 107-126.

[9] "Genesis XV. The covenant with Abram," *Oudtestamentische Studien*, XII (1958), pp. 261-279.

[10] *Genesis*, p. 178.

[11] Cf. Kaiser, *ZAW*, LXX (1958), pp. 110-111.

[12] *Genesis*, p. 179. Gunkel felt compelled to split up this verse in order that Jb and E would each have more or less complete stories. Verse 1b^{b} is viewed as Jb's equivalent to 12:1-3 (Ja), this being the first promise of a reward in Jb. In order to achieve better sense Gunkel was forced to suggest that 15:1b^{b} originally stood before 12:10 ff. (Jb). He says that in vs. 1b^{a} Abraham is presented as a man afraid, hence in need of a shield, therefore an E account of Abraham wandering to a strange land must be presupposed although it is no longer extant. Such a complicated reconstruction is surely forced.

[13] *ZAW*, LXX (1958).

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 113.

[15] Such an interpretation has more to commend it than the well known attempt by A. Alt to find in the expression מגן a remnant of a pre-Yahwistic patriarchal deity, the מגן אברהם . *Der Gott der Väter*, *BWANT*, Folge III, Heft 12 (1929), pp. 66-67. Cf. also the result of working out the implications of Alt's approach in the study by Alfred Jepsen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Vätergestalten," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig*, Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, Heft 2/3, III (1953-54), pp. 265-281, esp. pp. 275 ff.

[16] *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients* (Leipzig:

Hinrichs, 1930), p. 344. See also Martin Kessler, "The 'Shield' of Abraham?" VT, XIV (1964), pp. 494-497.

[17] Gunkel, Genesis, p. 177.

[18] Cf. Albright's view in M. F. Unger, Israel and the Arameans of Damascus (London: Clarke, 1957), pp. 3 and 114; see also H. Seebass, "GEN 15 2^b," ZAW, LXXV (1963), pp. 317-319.

[19] Cf. Alfons Schulz, "Eli'ezer?" ZAW, LII (1934), pp. 274-279; also P. I. Hershon, A Rabbinical Commentary on Genesis (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1885), p. 79.

[20] ZAW, XLII (1924), p. 67.

[21] Genesis, p. 277.

[22] ZAW, LXX (1958), p. 117.

[23] Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter (Leiden: Brill, 1956), esp. pp. 8-9.

[24] Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, pp. 177-178; and Skinner, Genesis, p. 277.

[25] Genesis, p. 178.

[26] E. g. Kaiser, ZAW, LXX (1958), pp. 118-119.

[27] Genesis, p. 117.

[28] ZAW, LXX (1958), p. 119.

[29] Chauvin, Muséon, V (1885), p. 103, followed by Gunkel, Genesis, p. 178; Simpson, ETI, p. 74.

[30] E. g. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 178.

[31] Snijders, "Genesis XV," p. 262.

[32] Die Composition, p. 22.

[33] "Genesis XV," p. 262.

IX GENESIS 23

This chapter, relating the story of Abraham's purchase of a burial ground at Hebron for his wife Sarah is generally ascribed to P (see App. D). The reasons for this assignment are: (i) the chronological interest (vs. 1);[1] (ii) the pedantic repetitious style;[2] (iii) allusions to the episode in subsequent P material;[3] (iv) a number of expressions and proper names characteristic of P elsewhere.[4]

In the main these arguments appear to be sound. The story is an interrupting element between the introduction of Nahor's descendants (22:20-24) and the story in which these descendants play an active part (ch. 24). It is likely that P inserted the chapter here so that Abraham could complete the purchase before becoming old and feeble, as he is depicted in ch. 24. This was, therefore, the most appropriate spot for the inclusion of the episode. The story was manifestly of considerable importance to P, since he goes into details in a manner reminiscent of his story of God's covenant with Abraham in ch. 17. For some reason P was concerned with the ownership of this burial ground and the circumstances under which it was obtained.[5] The site was very sacred to the Hebrews, for not only Sarah but Abraham (25:9), Isaac (35:29) and Jacob (50:13), and their wives Rebekah and Leah (49:29-33), were also buried at this spot. It must have been virtually a national shrine, or at least P wished it to be regarded as such.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IX

[1] Dillmann, Die Genesis, p. 296.

[2] Holzinger, Genesis, p. 133; also Gunkel, Genesis, p. 273.

[3] Skinner, Genesis, p. 335.

[4] Holzinger, Genesis, p. 133; Gunkel, Genesis, p. 273.

[5] A number of critics have attempted to account for the significance of this purchase. Holzinger felt that this episode was intended to give a basis to the Hebrew claim to the land of Palestine as a whole; see Genesis, p. 134. Gunkel's view was that the story was to make it clear that Abraham and Sarah were buried on land over which there could be no dispute with regard to ownership; see Genesis, pp. 274-275. Skinner's view that the story was an attempt to counter the Edomite claim to southern Judah in exilic times, see Genesis, p. 339, appears to be more satisfactory than any alternative proposed to date.

X GENESIS 24

This chapter which tells of Abraham sending a trusted servant to his old homeland in Aram-naharaim to acquire a wife for his son Isaac is recognized to be one of the finest examples of short story technique in the Book of Genesis.[1] On the basis of vocabulary and style it has long been felt that the entire chapter should be assigned to J.[2] If there are inconsistencies in it they are to be explained as the result of textual error or minor redactional change. Gunkel thought it possible to detect two strands, Ja and Jb. He believed that the two accounts must have been very similar originally, making it difficult for the critic to do more than note the major differences between them.[3] Several scholars have labelled one of the strands "E" despite the lack of linguistic evidence to support their view (see App. D). Skinner's principal reason for assigning one strand to E is that "a fusion of J^h and J^b (Gu) is without parallel, whereas J^b and E are combined in ch. 21."[4] Smend, like Skinner, believed that the J strand involved was the secondary strand, i.e., J2.[5] Simpson also assigns part of the narrative to J2 and goes so far as to suggest that the J2 material was "slightly revised" before its conflation with E.[6]

Since any evaluation of previous views regarding the literary structure of the chapter depends to a large extent on the attitude adopted towards a number of supposed duplications and inconsistencies, these will now be examined in the order of their occurrence. Following this, the relationship of the chapter to the sources previously encountered will be discussed.

(a) According to vss. 5, 6, 8, there is some possibility that the servant's mission will be a failure, whereas according to vs. 7, YHWH's angel will guarantee success. Hence Simpson assigns vs. 7 to J2 and vss. 5, 6, 8 to E.[7] Smend had arrived at the same conclusion and had attempted to defend it on linguistic grounds, claiming that לא אבה (vs. 5) is an E expression; a J writer would have employed מאן .[8] But

אבה occurs in Genesis only in vss. 5 and 8 of this chapter, while מאן occurs in at least one passage generally assigned to E (37:35). The conversation between Abraham and his servant in vss. 5-8 can best be understood in the light of the servant's account in vss. 37 ff. of the circumstances surrounding his mission. He states that when he asked his master what he should do in case the girl was unwilling to return with him, Abraham had assured him that YHWH would send his angel ahead to assure success, but if the girl should fail to agree, the servant would be free from his oath. This is exactly the case in vss. 5-8. On the one hand, there is a concession to the doubt in the servant's mind; he is reassured that his master is not binding him to an impossible oath. On the other hand, we have an expression of Abraham's faith; the mission is in accordance with YHWH's will and therefore will not fail. The contrasting attitudes of master and servant towards the mission form an artistic whole instead of being evidence of two sources.[9]

(b) Verse 10 calls Rebekah's home both "Aram-naharaim" and "the city of Nahor", and this is taken as evidence for the presence of two sources. Smend, for example, assigned "Aram-naharaim" to E, and "the city of Nahor" to J.[10] Procksch, on the other hand, reversed this assignment.[11] It is surely more natural to regard the two statements as complementary, "Aram-naharaim" denoting the general area, and "the city of Nahor" the specific place within it. A similar phenomenon is found in 12:6 where Abraham is referred to as coming "to the site of Shechem, to the terebinth of Moreh," the latter phrase denoting the exact spot at Shechem. The use of the expression "city of Nahor" is no doubt influenced by the references to Nahor in the genealogy (22:20-24) which once immediately preceded ch. 24.

The double occurrence of וילך in vs. 10, which has sometimes been taken as another witness to the presence of two sources, can be explained as an instance of bad composition on the author's part or, more likely, the first occurrence is a case of textual corruption and should be deleted.

(c) In vs. 22 the servant presents a gift to the girl, whereas according to vs. 53 the gifts were distributed later. However, there is no necessary contradiction here. The first gift was in return for her watering his camels. In view of the fact that its value seems out of all proportion to the service rendered, it seems likely that it was intended by the author to suggest the wealth of Abraham and perhaps to impress the girl with the fact that she was dealing with someone of importance. Later on, larger gifts are presented to the family as a whole, Rebekah included. A good Oriental story-teller would readily provide two settings for a rich stranger to dispense his gifts.

(d) In vss. 23-25 more than one hand has been detected because of: (i) the repetition of ותאמר in vss. 24 and 25; (ii) the supposed unnatural order of the events related in vss. 22 and 23.[12] It would seem more natural to have the servant inquire as to the girl's identity before presenting her with a gift, and this order is actually found in the back-reference to the incident in vs. 47. On the other hand, if the gift was merely a reward for a service rendered, there is no reason why the servant might not have presented it before asking the girl who she was. Here too, the story-teller's art may be observed. Strict logic cannot be applied to the narration of these events.

The most unnatural feature of this section of the narrative is the compression of two somewhat unrelated questions into vs. 23. Good style would seem to require that the reply to one question be given before the next question is introduced. The fact that the author has chosen to arrange the dialogue as we find it can only be condemned as bad style. It is not a proof of two sources.

(e) Verse 23 speaks of the *father's house*, while vs. 28 tells of Rebekah running to her *mother's house*. To regard this as evidence of two sources, as Skinner did,[13] is to overlook the contexts in which the references occur. In vs. 23, where it is a matter of providing fodder for the camels, it is natural that the father should be mentioned, and equally natural that in vs. 24 the girl should be represented as running to her mother to tell the news and show her gifts.

(f) It is claimed that Laban is represented as making two trips to the well to greet the stranger (vss. 29-30); hence once again two sources are suspected.[14] It seems likely, however, that vs. 29b is to be read after vs. 30a, as Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*, has suggested.

(g) Two sources are suspected from the fact that in vss. 50-51 Laban and Bethuel give their consent to the marriage, whereas in vss. 57-58 the decision is made by Rebekah herself.[15] There is, however, no discrepancy between these two sections. The story has made allowance from the beginning for the possibility that the girl may refuse to leave her home; hence it is implied that the final decision will rest with her. It would be quite improper and quite out of accord with Semitic practice that she should be allowed complete freedom of choice. Hence the story demands that the consent of her family first be obtained. Once this matter has been disposed of, the author is free to focus attention on the girl and her decision. Such a sequence is much more dramatically satisfying than if the consent of Rebekah had been obtained first.

It has often been noted that Bethuel plays little part in the story. In the account of the distribution of the gifts (vs. 53), he is not mentioned. Presumably he is thought of as very old. It is significant that in vs. 50 Laban is mentioned before his father, a subtle touch designed to suggest that Laban was now the dominant member of the household.

(h) It is said that the departure of Rebekah is twice recorded (vs. 61a and 61b) and that the mention of both Rebekah's nurse (vs. 59) and her maidens (vss. 59, 61) confuses the picture. The reason for the mention of the nurse is obvious; it is to pave the way for the later reference to her in 35:8. As for vs. 61b, it was probably designed by the author to complete the story of the servant's mission at the "city of Nahor."

An examination of these arguments for a two-strand theory reveals that the evidence fails to support it. The chapter is a good example of the Oriental story-teller's art. There is good reason, therefore, to regard the chapter as a literary unity.

It may be noted that two words occur which are found elsewhere in later sources: פנה Pi. "to clear out" (vs. 31)--found from the time of Deutero-Isaiah on (see Lev. 14:36; Isa. 40:3; 57:14; 62:10; Zech. 3:15; Mal. 3:1; Ps. 80:10); מגדנת (vs. 53), elsewhere only in the work of the Chronicler.

Several critics have noted the strong theological tone of this chapter, especially in connection with the manner in which YHWH's providential concern has been expressed, and consequently have relegated the chapter to "den spätesten Stadien der Abraham-Überlieferung."[16] Martin Noth calls the chapter "ein spätes Verbindungsstück."[17] While the J story has recounted Abraham's response to a divine command and his faithful adherence to YHWH's design for him, ch. 24 goes beyond anything encountered thus far seen in that source. The epithet אלהי השמים (vs. 3), is generally taken as a late gloss (see App. D). Since it is not used elsewhere before the Persian period,[18] most critics feel that the term cannot be original in a source as early as J. If the author of this chapter was a later writer, however, a late date is no problem and the text may stand.

The latter part of ch. 24 raises the question of the original position of the account of Sarah's death in the pre-P form of the narrative. One thing is clear, the present text of vs. 67 cannot be due to changes on the part of P since he has related the death of Sarah in ch. 23. It is customary to regard the words "(to) Sarah his mother" as a later addition and to change the last word of the sentence (אמו) to מות אביו "the death of his father."[19] This can only be termed drastic procedure. From the fact that in 24:65 the servant refers to Isaac as "my master" it is usually assumed that Abraham was dead and that an account of his death once stood in ch. 24. But it is difficult to find a place where such an account could have stood. Wellhausen favored a location immediately after 24:62, but he also noted that 25:1-6 must have preceded ch. 24.[20] Gunkel favored vs. 9 as the spot where Jb had mentioned Abraham's death,[21] while Simpson favors an original mention following 24:1.[22] Actually the servant's reference to Isaac as "my master" does not necessarily imply that Abraham was dead. The expression may be intended merely as a title of respect used in the presence of Rebekah with reference to her husband-to-be. In any case, Isaac as the son and heir of his aged father was in fact the servant's master also. Since Abraham is alive when ch. 25 begins, it is clear that the final editor would not have permitted a notice of Abraham's death to stand in 24:67, even if it had been original. The difficulties in the present text are readily admitted, but it may be that אמו is a corruption from מות/אמו . This, however, is merely conjecture.

The wording of the first part of vs. 62 (ויצחק בא מבוא באר לחי ראי) is rather curious. It seems to suggest that Isaac and his parents had moved from Beersheba, where they were last reported as living (22:19), to Beer-lahai-roi. Since the servant sent to Aram-naharaim is doubtless thought of as returning to the place from which he had set out, it is likely that the writer thinks of the movement to Beer-lahai-roi as having taken place before the servant set out on his mission. The servant, accompanied by Rebekah, is on his way back to Beer-lahai-roi when he encounters Isaac somewhere in the vicinity.

This chapter is to be designated as X.

NOTES ON CHAPTER X

[1] Skinner, Genesis, p. 340.

[2] Dillmann, Die Genesis, p. 300.

[3] Genesis, p. 248.

[4] Genesis, p. 340.

[5] Die Erzählung, p. 48.

[6] ETI, p. 85.

[7] Ibid., p. 85.

[8] Die Erzählung, p. 48.

[9] Cf. Volz, Der Elohist, p. 55.

[10] Die Erzählung, p. 49.

[11] Die Genesis, p. 149.

[12] Simpson, ETI, p. 85.

[13] Skinner, Genesis, p. 340.

[14] Ibid., p. 340.

[15] Simpson, ETI, p. 85.

[16] A. Jepsen, "Zur Überlieferung," p. 277; cf. also G. von Rad, Genesis, ATD, pp. 222-223.

[17] ÜP, p. 114.

[18] D. K. Andrews, "Yahweh the God of the Heavens," The Seed of Wisdom, ed. W. S. McCullough (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), pp. 45-57.

[19] Wellhausen, Die Composition, p. 28.

[20] Ibid., p. 27.

[21] Genesis, p. 252.

[22] ETI, pp. 85-86.

XI GENESIS 25:1-18

The story of Abraham concludes with a list of the patriarch's South Arabian descendants (vss. 1-6), an account of his death and burial (vss. 7-11), and a list of his North Arabian descendants (vss. 12-18). An attempt must now be made to relate these three blocks of material to the sources previously encountered in the Abraham Story.

Vss. 1-6. Abraham's South Arabian descendants.

Abraham is said to have married another wife whose name was Keturah and by her to have had six sons. The children of two of these sons (Jokshan and Midian) are listed, yielding a total of sixteen South Arabian names. The circumstances under which Abraham acquired this Arabian wife are not given. This suggests that the story of the marriage was a later development which never succeeded in becoming well integrated into the older tradition. Most critics assign the passage to J but regard it as a late strand of J and label it Jr (see App. D). Those who think that Abraham's death is presupposed in the latter part of ch. 24 feel that the passage is out of place here. Eissfeldt has suggested that vss. 1-4 originally preceded ch. 18 in his L source, presumably because Abraham would take a second wife before becoming too old (18:11 ff.).[1] These alternatives, however, do not account for the present position of the story, which must have been felt to be appropriate by the final editor of Genesis. If, however, Sarah, not Abraham, died at the close of ch. 24, Abraham would be free here for further marital exploits. The present chapter is thus the logical spot for such material.

Attention should be drawn to the occurrence of the word מתנת (vs. 6), which appears elsewhere in Hebrew only in late writings,[2] and the repetition in vs. 5 of the statement found in 24:36 regarding Abraham's treatment of Isaac: ויתן־לו את־כל־אשר־לו . The evidence suggests that 25:1-6 bears some connection with the previous chapter and that it is in its original position following ch. 24, and may be assigned to the same writer.

Vss. 7-11. The death and burial of Abraham.

There is general agreement that vss. 7-10 are the work of P (see App. D) for the following reasons: (i) the chronological interest; (ii) the occurrence of typical P expressions: ימי שני חיי (vs. 7), בשיבה טובה (vs. 8), ויאסף אל־עמיו (vs. 8), אלהים (vs. 11).

Opinions differ regarding vs. 11. Eissfeldt would assign vs. 11a to E as an introduction to 26:3b-5 which he feels is E.[3] Verse 11b is often regarded as a misplaced bit of J. Gunkel, for example, suggested that it originally stood after 24:67.[4] Simpson feels that it originated with J1 but was used by J2 after 24:1 and then shifted by R^P to its present position.[5] There seems to be no good reason, however, why the whole verse cannot be assigned to P. Critics have fastened on parts of this verse to reinforce their theory of parallel documents, but if P were annotating an earlier story, as has been suggested, he would be aware of Isaac's connection with Beer-lahai-roi, noted above in 24:62.

Vss. 12-18. Abraham's North Arabian descendants.

This section gives a list of the twelve sons of Ishmael, Abraham's son by Hagar. Verses 12-17 are attributed to P for the following reasons: (i) the typical P expressions, נשיאם (vs. 16), לאמתם (vs. 16) and ויאסף אל־עמין (vs. 17); (ii) it forms an essential part of P's toledoth scheme; (iii) the chronological note in vs. 17.

Regarding vs. 18 there is disagreement. It is obvious that the verse did not originally follow vs. 17 since Ishmael, referred to in vs. 17, is not a natural antecedent for "and they dwelt" (וישכנו) at the beginning of vs. 18. Gunkel and Simpson believe that the verse once stood at the end of ch. 16 (see App. D). Skinner, on the other hand, felt that there was considerable plausibility in Holzinger's conjecture that it was the conclusion to J's lost genealogy of Ishmael.[6]

Neither theory is fully satisfactory. It seems much more natural to regard it as the continuation of vss. 1-6. In that case, the use of the plural וישכנו is explained and there is no need for textual emendation.

Further support for assigning this verse to a secondary J hand is the presence of the statement על־פני כל־אחיו נפל which echoes the destiny predicted for Ishmael in 16:12: ועל־פני כל־אחיו ישכן . Here it is implied that all of the descendants of the concubines were given the same fate.[7]

The above study of 25:1-18 indicates that its literary structure is as follows: X--vss. 1-6, 18; P--vss. 7-17.

It is possible that 25:6 provides a clue to the nature of the lost conclusion to J's story of the expulsion of Hagar in ch. 16. It will be recalled that in that chapter the J narrative had been cut off at vs. 9 with the angel ordering Hagar to return home and submit to her mistress. Since it is unlikely that Hagar did not obey, the narrative must have gone on to tell of her return, the birth and naming of the child and of Abraham eventually sending the child and his mother away to the desert. In 25:6 it is stated that "to the sons of the concubines which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts and sent them away from his son Isaac while he was still living, eastward to the land of Qedem." Who are the concubines referred to here? It is likely that a later writer thought of Keturah, the mother of the South Arabian tribes, as possessing the same status as Hagar, the mother of the North Arabian peoples. Hence the "concubines" referred to in vs. 6 are none other than Hagar and Keturah. Their offspring are said to have been treated in the same manner. Since the figure of Keturah appears to be a later addition to the Abraham tradition, it is probable that the basis of the statement that Abraham gave gifts to the sons of his concubines and sent them away was to be found in J's account concerning Abraham's treatment of Hagar and her son.

By the time of E, this vague statement had developed into the detailed imaginative story of a second expulsion which we find in 21:8-21. Whether J contained a prediction that Ishmael would become a nation cannot now be ascertained in view of the curtailment of his narrative, but certainly this prediction appears in E (21:13), and seems to imply that Ishmael was already thought of as the ancestor of the Arabs.

Furthermore in E, Ishmael is made to settle in the desert of Paran, south of the Negeb, and his mother obtains a wife for him from Egypt. It evidently came to be felt that this was not the most appropriate home for the ancestor of the Northern Arabs, so in 25:6 the writer had Abraham send the sons of his concubines eastward to the land of Qedem (presumably Arabia) where, according to vs. 18, "they dwelt from Hawilah to Shur which is over against Egypt all the way to Assyria. . . ."

NOTES ON CHAPTER XI

[1] HS, p. 260*.

[2] See Procksch, Die Genesis, p. 145.

[3] HS, pp. 46* and 260*.

[4] Genesis, p. 260.

[5] ETI, p. 86.

[6] Genesis, p. 349.

[7] Speiser, Genesis, pp. 187-188, has noted that in the present context npl must be taken with distributive force. Hence, "each made forays against his various kinsmen."

XII THE LITERARY DEVELOPMENT OF THE ABRAHAM STORY

The detailed study of the Abraham Story carried out above has yielded abundant evidence that the story is not the creation of a single author but that several hands have contributed to giving it its present form. Four stages in the literary growth of the Abraham traditions have been detected: (i) a basic story, narrated by an author who employs the divine name YHWH and who is therefore designated by the symbol J; (ii) a supplement, appended to the J story by a writer who employs the divine name Elohim and who is therefore referred to as E; (iii) supplements at numerous points to the combined JE narrative by an editor or editors employing the divine name YHWH. In view of the fact that the supplements are miscellaneous in character and that it is still uncertain whether they represent the work of one or several hands, these additions have been designated by X, a conventional symbol for the unknown. (iv) Still later annotation and supplementation by a priestly editor customarily called P. These four stages in the development of the story will now be examined in turn to determine, if possible, the features which characterize each and the factors which led to the successive amplification of the primary tradition.

1. The basic J story.

The basic J narrative as isolated in the above analysis is as follows: 12:1, 4a, 5b^{b}-7, 9-20; 13:1-2, 5, 7-10a, 11-13, 18; 16:1-2, 4-9; 18:1-16, 20-21, 33, 22a; 19:1-16* (omitting שני המלאכים in vs. 1 and reading האנשים in vs. 15), 24-25, 27a, 28.

In obedience to a divine command to leave his home for a new land Abraham set out, accompanied by the members of his family and his nephew Lot. When he reached Shechem in the land of Canaan, YHWH appeared to him and promised to give the land to his descendants. Abraham built an altar at the site of this divine revelation. From Shechem he moved gradually to the Negeb but famine conditions compelled him to move on to Egypt. Afraid that the Egyptians might kill him in order to lay hands on his wife Sarah, Abraham had her tell people that she was his sister. When word of the beauty of this foreign woman reached Pharaoh, he took her into his household and presented her "brother" with great wealth in the form of livestock and male and female slaves. But YHWH smote Pharaoh and his house with severe plagues because of Sarah. When Pharaoh learned the truth about Sarah, he reprimanded Abraham for deceiving him and had him and his party escorted out of the country.

Abraham and Lot returned to the Negeb with their newly acquired wealth. There a quarrel broke out between their shepherds and the two men decided to separate. Given first choice of territory, Lot chose the kikkar of the Jordan and moved his tent to Sodom. Abraham remained in the land of Canaan and moved his tent to the terebinths of Mamre at Hebron. There he built an altar to YHWH.

Abraham's wife Sarah was barren so she suggested to her husband that he have intercourse with her Egyptian maid Hagar. He followed his wife's advice and Hagar became pregnant. She now became so insolent towards her mistress that Sarah found her presence intolerable and, with her husband's tacit approval, drove her out into the desert to fend for herself. There at a spring on the road to Shur, YHWH's angel found her and ordered her to return home and to submit to her mistress. Presumably she did so and bore her child in Abraham's house, although this part of the J narrative has not been preserved.

At Mamre Abraham was visited by three celestial beings, one of whom was YHWH. After accepting Abraham's generous hospitality, YHWH announced that despite the advanced age of Abraham and his wife, Sarah would bear a son the following year. The three visitors then set out in the direction of Sodom, and Abraham accompanied them part of the way. YHWH informed Abraham that a great outcry had reached him in heaven about the wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah and he had come down to investigate. YHWH then departed and Abraham returned home.

The two men, who had been accompanying YHWH, reached Sodom in the evening. Lot, who was sitting in the gate of Sodom, saw them and invited them to spend the night in his house rather than in the open. After some urging, they accepted. Before long, a crowd--said to consist of all the males of Sodom--surrounded the house, clamoring to have sexual relations with the newcomers. Lot endeavored to spare his guests by offering the crowd his two virgin daughters, but they would have none of them and tried to force their way into the house. The two "men" now acted to save Lot and smote the Sodomites with blindness. At the same time they ordered Lot to get all members of his family out of the city at once as they were going to destroy it. Lot went out and warned his "sons-in-law who were to marry his daughters" but they only ridiculed him. As dawn broke the "men" once again urged Lot to take his family and leave before it was too late. When he hesitated, they seized him and his wife and two daughters by the hand and conducted them outside the city. Then YHWH rained fire and brimstone on Sodom and Gomorrah and devastated the whole kikkar area. In the morning when Abraham looked down on the region, he beheld a column of smoke ascending to heaven like the smoke from a kiln.

Two features of this story immediately strike the reader: first, the abrupt manner in which it begins, and secondly, the abrupt manner in which it ends. The story begins dramatically with the incident of Abraham's call. No attempt is made to introduce Abraham, to explain who he was or even where the call took place. The absence of such background information in J might be accounted for in either of two ways: (i) it may have been once in J but has been deleted by a later editor who wished to give his own version of it; (ii) J may not have thought it necessary to incorporate such information in his narrative since an acquaintance with it on the part of the reader or listener might be taken for granted. If, for example, the J narrative was intended for use in the cult, only the more dramatic incidents in the life of the patriarch may have been deemed necessary for inclusion. Nonetheless, it is difficult to believe that even an abbreviated cultic document would not have mentioned the fulfillment of the divine promises to Hagar and Sarah in the birth of their sons Ishmael and Isaac. The probability is, therefore, that the J story once had a longer form than that isolated by literary analysis.

A third feature of the story which impresses the reader is its pronounced religious character. Abraham is depicted not as a military conqueror, such as Joshua, but as a religious figure, a man of God. He is a devout worshipper of YHWH long before Moses' time, a man of simple faith and unquestioning obedience to the divine command, one in whom even YHWH himself confides. As a reward for his faith and obedience he received two divine promises: the promise of the land of Canaan (12:7), and the promise of an heir (18:1-15).

As a work of literary art, the story ranks high. It is vivid, compact, with no excess verbiage of any kind. Whether its polished character is to be attributed to J who committed the tradition to writing, or is the result of a long period of oral transmission is difficult to say. It is customary to give the credit to J.

There is little in the story which contains any hint as to the date of J. The fact that David's capital was for a time at Hebron may have encouraged the growth or collection of traditions about the reputed founder of the Hebron sanctuary and out of this may have come J. This hypothesis would favor the early monarchy as a date for this source. In view of the fact that only a limited amount of J material has been encountered thus far, it is impossible to be more specific regarding the matter of date.

2. The E supplement.

The following passages were found to comprise an E supplement to the J account: 20:1-17; 21:2, 6-32; 22:1-13 (reading אלהים for יהוה in vs. 11), 19. They relate four incidents in the life of the patriarch which are not referred to in the J narrative, although two (the taking of Sarah into the household of Abimelech, king of Gerar in 20:1-17, and the expulsion of Hagar and her son Ishmael, 21:2, 6-21) have close counterparts in J (see above, pp. 74, 76-77). In 20:1-17 Abraham is defended against any charge of untruthfulness to which the J story in 12:10-20 leaves him open, and in 21:2, 6-21 he is defended against any charge of inhumanity towards Hagar such as might be levelled at him on the basis of 16:1-2, 4-9. The apologetic character of these two E stories has been noted above (see pp. 74, 77). The aim of E is accomplished not by tampering with the J version or by recasting the story in such a way as to remove all objectionable features. Rather, E has composed supplementary stories of similar character, having Abraham move to a new locale in the Negeb to enact these episodes. Sandmel has accurately termed this editorial method, "neutralizing by addition."[1] E's scrupulous respect for the J story suggests that it already enjoyed an official status.

The third incident related in the E supplement has to do with Abraham and Abimelech of Gerar making a treaty at Beersheba (21:22-32). This E story has no counterpart in J. Winnett has suggested that it may have been added in response to "a demand from Beersheba that its claim to have also been the scene of some of the patriarch's activity be recognized."[2] The abrupt manner in which the incident is introduced in 21:22 is noteworthy. No attempt is made to explain how or why Abraham and Abimelech happened to be together. This suggests that something has been omitted from E at this point. Evidence will be found below in dealing with 26:15 for believing that some E material concerning Abraham was later transferred to the Isaac Story.

The fourth incident in the E supplement relates the test of Abraham's faith (22:1-13, 19). As pointed out above (p. 81), the style of this story is so superior to E's stories in chs. 21 and 22 that some scholars believe that he must have derived it from J. Against this is the fact that there is no other evidence that the J narrative had Abraham move away from Hebron once he settled down there. It is probable, therefore, that E derived the story from a separate source.

The supplement added by E to the J narrative thus seems to consist of two stories composed by himself with the purpose of improving the image of Abraham, and of two traditions drawn from other sources. If the J narrative had an official status, it is reasonable to assume that the E revision of it also had an official character.

It has been noted above (see pp. 82-83) that the evidence available from a study of chs. 20-22 is insufficient to make any definite judgment concerning the date and provenance of E. He has recorded southern traditions and his work is clearly later than that of J, but further comment must await the analysis of the Jacob Story.

3. The X additions.

The analysis of chs. 12-25 disclosed that the JE form of the Abraham Story has been expanded at a considerable number of points by an editor, or editors, employing the divine name YHWH. It is necessary now to review these secondary elements with a view to discovering, if possible, whether they represent the work of a single reviser or whether they must be attributed to several editorial hands. The passages in question are as follows: 11:28-31; 12:2-3, 8; 13:3-4; 10b, 14-17; 14:1-24; 15:1-21; 16:10-14; 18:17-19, 22b-32; 19:1 (שני המלאכים), 15 (המלאכים), 17-23, 26, 27b, 30-38; 20:18; 21:1, 33-34; 22:11 (יהוה), 14-18, 20-24; 24:1-67; 25:1-6, 18.

Four of the X passages (12:2-3; 13:14-17; 15:1-19; 22:14-18) relate divine promises to Abraham: (a) that he would become a great nation (12:2), and that he would be so blessed that his name would be used by all the peoples of the earth in blessings (12:3; 22:18); and (b) that the whole land of Canaan would be the property of his descendants (13:14-15, 17; 15:18-19), and that his descendants would be as innumerable as the stars in the sky (15:5, 22:17), or as the dust of the earth (13:16), or as the sand on the seashore (22:17). Another X passage (18:17-19), while not itself a promise, refers to the promises and contains several expressions found in them. The close relationship of all these passages is apparent from the following excerpts:

(a)

12:3 ונברכו בך כל משפחת האדמה
18:18 ונברכו בו כל גויי הארץ
22:18 והתברכו בזרעך כל גויי הארץ

(b)

12:2 ואעשך לגוי גדול ואברכך ואגדלה שמך
18:18 ואברהם היו יהיה לגוי גדול ועצום

22:17 והרבה ארבה את־זרעך ככוכבי השמים וכחול אשר
על־שפת הים
13:16 ושמתי את־זרעך כעפר הארץ אשר אם־יוכל איש למנות
את־עפר הארץ גם־זרעך ימנה
15:5 ... וספר הכוכבים אם־תוכל לספר אתם ויאמר לו
כה יהיה זרעך

In view of the close similarity, and in places identity, of these passages in style, vocabulary, and point of view, there can be no reasonable doubt that they proceed from the same hand.

It has long been noted by scholars that all of these passages, excluding ch. 15 for the present, can be removed without disturbing the contexts in which they occur. This fact in itself suggests that they are not integral parts of the narrative but constitute later expansions of it. They have been inserted by someone who was not satisfied with the brief promises in J (the land in 12:7, an heir in 18:10-15). The promises now take on glowing colours; a glorious future for Abraham's descendants is predicted; Israel is to be a great and powerful nation, recognized by other peoples as uniquely blessed. The occurrence of the prophetic formula נאם־יהוה in 22:16 also suggests a date after the time of J. Additional indications of date may be found in the presence of Deuteronomic phraseology in 18:17-19 and in the mention of the Chaldeans in ch. 15 (vs. 7).

Three complete chapters have been assigned to X: 14, 15 and 24. The first two of these may be considered at this point. The object of the inclusion of the legend narrated in the first part of ch. 14 was apparently to suggest the time in which Abraham lived by setting him in a framework of Near Eastern history. In the latter part of the chapter Abraham is brought into as close touch with the Jerusalem sanctuary as the historical circumstances permitted (see above, p. 88). Expressions regarded as characteristic of P occur in both parts of the chapter: the noun רכש in vss. 11, 12, 16, 21; ילידי בית in vs. 14 (elsewhere in Genesis in ch. 17, a P composition, vss. 12, 13, 23, 27 and Lev. 22:11), נפש in the sense of "person" in vs. 21 (cf. 12:4, P, and App. C). It is not possible to explain the presence of these expressions by the theory that the story has been glossed by P since these terms appear to be too deeply embedded in the narrative to be glosses. The most natural explanation is that the chapter is a relatively late composition and that its author is to be dated at a time not far distant from that of P.

Chapter 15, which has been referred to briefly above in discussing the divine promises to Abraham, presents the most elaborate treatment of the promise motif. While the setting of these promises and of the solemn covenant which sealed them is not explicitly stated, it is probably more than mere coincidence that the account comes directly after ch. 14, the latter part of which has its setting outside the walls of Jerusalem. It seems to be implied, without being explicitly stated, that the fullest form of the promises to Abraham was given at (although not in) Jerusalem.

The chapter contains a few features which suggest a date later than the time of J: the expressions מחזה (vs. 1) and היה דבר־יהוה (vs. 1) which have conceptual affinities with the prophetic literature, אדני יהוה (vs. 2), the typically Deuteronomic expression לתת ... לרשתה (vss. 7-8), the reference to the Chaldeans (vs. 7), the occurrence of two expressions usually regarded as characteristic of P: רכש (vs. 14, see above on 14:11-12) and בשיבה טובה (vs. 15, see 25:8, P).

Chapters 14 and 15 deal with quite different subjects. Nevertheless they exhibit points of connection (see above, p. 95) and each contains a few so-called P expressions and other indications of late date. Furthermore, each manifests a pro-Jerusalem bias.

Chapter 14 is linked to two other passages assigned to X in that they all give expression to the view that YHWH was worshipped in Canaan in patriarchal times under the name of *El*. In 14:22 Abraham is represented as identifying *El-'elyon*, the god of Jerusalem, with YHWH; in 16:13-14 Hagar calls the god who spoke to her *El-roi*, although it was really YHWH; in 21:33 Abraham invokes YHWH under the name of *El-'olam* at Beersheba. It is not unreasonable to suggest that 16:13-14 and 21:33 come from the same hand as ch. 14. The theory behind these *El*-passages receives clear formulation at the hands of P in Ex. 6:3 (see above, p. 47). It is significant for the problem of date that once again connections are found between some of the X passages and P.

One of the *El*-passages (21:33) is linked to two other X passages (12:8; 13:4) by the employment of the expression קרא בשם יהוה . It may be pointed out too that 21:33 is an editorial addendum to the block of E material in ch. 21. This suggests that the author of this and related passages must be dated after the time of E.

One of the passages attributed to X (11:28-31) was manifestly added to supply information lacking in J concerning the patriarch's immediate family and his place of origin. Its two-fold reference to the Chaldeans stamps it as the work of an author living subsequent to the rise of the Chaldean empire in the late seventh century B.C. Two other X passages (22:20-24 and 25:1-6) furnish lists of some of Abraham's descendants and relatives, the first giving a list of his Aramean relatives (the twelve sons of his brother Nahor), the other a list of his six South Arabian sons by Keturah, plus ten grandsons. The fact that these two lists have a number of expressions in common (ילד "to beget", 22:23 and 25:3; פילגש, 22:24 and 25:6; and compare שמנה אלה 22:23 with כל־אלה 25:4) suggests that the two passages are by the same hand. The reference to Kesed, the ancestor of the Chaldeans, in 22:22 as well as the use of the late word מתנת in 25:6 (see above, p. 113) suggest that the author is to be dated no earlier than the Chaldean period.

The addition to the JE narrative of the three passages listed above is readily intelligible if a later editor was trying to construct a complete Life of Abraham. It may be taken for granted that there was an oral tradition about Abraham before there was a written tradition. J seems to have selected from this oral tradition only those elements which served his purpose. Later the written tradition by J was augmented by an E supplement, as has been noted above (see pp. 120-121). Still later it seems to have been felt desirable to ensure the preservation of certain items of traditional lore not utilized by J or E by adding them to the written tradition.

The most extensive example of such lore is that found in ch. 24 which relates how Abraham sent a trusted servant back to his old home to get a wife for his son Isaac. The late date of the chapter in its present form is indicated by the occurrence of such expressions as פנה, *Pi'el* "to clear out" (vs. 31)--found from the time of Deutero-Isaiah on (see Lev. 14:36; Is. 40:3; 57:14; 62:10; Zech. 3:15; Mal. 3:1; Ps. 80:10); מגדנת (vs. 53), elsewhere only in the work of the Chronicler; and אלהי השמים (vs. 3), not used elsewhere before the Persian period. In view of the probable late date of the chapter, there is no inherent reason why it should not be by the same person who augmented the JE story of Abraham by adding the biographical details mentioned directly above.

Two passages in ch. 18 have been seen to disrupt the flow of the basic story. The first, vss. 17-19, has to do with providing a fuller discussion of YHWH's plan to destroy Sodom (see above, pp. 58-59). Abraham was chosen by YHWH to charge his descendants to keep the way of YHWH by doing righteousness and justice so that the blessings which had been promised might come about. Attention has been called to the presence of Deuteronomic coloring in vs. 19 (see above, p. 58), suggesting that the passage is of post-Deuteronomic date. The close relationship of these verses to the four promise-passages has been mentioned above.

The second passage in ch. 18 which was assigned to X is vss. 22b-32 relating a conversation between YHWH and Abraham on the justice of destroying all the inhabitants of Sodom without discrimination. As noted earlier (see p. 59), the question of indiscriminate punishment was a particularly live issue following the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. The fact that both passages have a similar theological character suggests that they are of common authorship.

The only remaining X passages which require comment are 19:17-23 and 30-38. The first of these is out of harmony with the urgent spirit of the basic story and is regarded by most scholars as a secondary expansion (see above, p. 65). Zoar seems to have been the nearest surviving town to the scene of the destruction in the *kikkar*. In 19:17-23 we probably see the incorporation into the Abraham tradition of a legend current in Zoar about the role it played at the time of Sodom's destruction. The passage contains no clear evidence of date but has two word-links (באך and צער) with 13:10b which is recognized to be secondary (see pp. 35-36). Verses 30-38, dealing with the origin of the Moabites and Ammonites, are also without any clear indication of date. In view of the mention of Zoar it is probable that the passage is by the same hand as vss. 17-23.

Although the X passages deal with a great variety of subjects, many of them can be classified in groups, and some of these groups are interconnected by the common employment of distinctive expressions, as demonstrated above. Furthermore, whenever they contain evidence of date, that evidence points to a period no earlier than the rise of the Chaldean empire or the publication of Deuteronomy (both in the late seventh century B.C.). Beyond this it is impossible to go at the moment.

The question assumes a new dimension with the observation that the X passages share many distinctive expressions with the Yahwistic material in Genesis 1-11. The most noteworthy of these are as follows:

	Gen. 1-11	X Passages in the Abraham Story
אהלה	9:21	12:8; 13:3
באכה	10:19, 19, 30	13:10; 19:22 (באך); 25:18
גם־הוא	4:4, 22, 26; 10:21	19:38; 22:20, 24
הוא (היה) אבי	4:20, 21; 9:18	19:37-38
הרבה ארבה	3:16	16:10; 22:17
חיה זרע	7:3	19:32, 34
חמר	11:3	14:10
"to beget"ילד	4:18, 18, 18; 10:8, 13, 15, 24, 24, 26	22:23; 25:3
כל־אלה	10:29	14:3; 15:10; 25:4
משפחת	10:18	12:3
קרא בשם יהוה	4:26	12:8; 13:4; 21:33
שכן	9:27; cf. the Hiph'il in 3:24	14:13; 16:12; 25:18
תרדמה	2:21	15:12

To this list the following place-names may be added:

אדמה	10:19	14:2, 8
אור כשדים	11:28, 31	15:7
הר הקדם	10:30	ארץ קדם 25:6
חוילה	10:29	25:18
עילם	10:22	14:1, 9
צביים	10:19	14:2, 8
שנער	10:10; 11:2	14:1

None of these expressions occurs in the basic J narrative, which suggests that the J writer of the Abraham Story and the author of the Yahwistic material in Genesis 1-11 are different writers entirely. The evidence points rather to the possibility that the material called X in the present study and the so-called J material in chs. 1-11 are the work of one and the same person.

The close thematic relationship between the Yahwistic material in chs. 1-11 and the X material has been demonstrated by Winnett,[3] and need not be repeated here. Attention should also be drawn to the fact that both the Yahwistic accounts in chs. 1-11 and the secondary Yahwistic material in the Abraham Story contain oracles to individuals predicting the fate of their descendants. Such decrees are found in: 3:14-19; 9:25-27; 12:2-3; 16:10-12.

C. J. de Catanzaro, in his doctoral dissertation, "A Literary Analysis of Genesis I-XI," has demonstrated that a good case can be made for believing that the J material in chs. 1-11 is the work of a single author and that he may be dated between the revival of Babylonian power under a Chaldean dynasty in 625 B.C. and the Persian conquest of Babylon in 539.[4] (This dissertation is summarized in an excursus appended to the present chapter). There is nothing in the evidence encountered to date which would preclude assigning the X material to the same general period; in fact, whenever the X passages contain evidence of date, the evidence points to a period subsequent to the rise of the Chaldeans. It is apparent that the continued use of the symbol J to denote the author of the Yahwistic passages in Genesis 1-11 and of the secondary, hitherto called X, passages in the Abraham Story can only lead to complete confusion. Adoption of the symbol J2 is ruled out because the theories held by previous critics regarding its date and relation to the earlier J strand differ significantly from that suggested above. The present writer has therefore decided to use the symbol C. This symbol is all the more appropriate because it begins to appear that C may have been the Compiler of the Book of Genesis in its pre-P form. This must remain tentative until the Isaac and Jacob stories have been examined.

4. The P material.

In the analysis of the Abraham Story the following passages were attributed to P: 11:26-27, 32; 12:4b-5b[a]; 13:6; 16:3, 15-16; 17:1-27; 19:29; 21:3-5; 23:1-20; 25:7-17. It is impossible to conceive of the P material in the Abraham Story as a connected document. Apart from chs. 17 and 23, P's contribution to the story amounts to little more than a number of brief comments dealing with chronology and genealogy. While P is not the "foundation" source as critics once maintained, it is obvious that P is responsible for the final ordering of the material. In this sense, he may be called the last editor of Genesis. His chronological scheme appears to have determined the final order of the story. That this chronology is artificially constructed is immediately evident. Abraham is 75 years old when he enters Canaan (12:4b-5), 100 years of age when Isaac is born (21:5), and 175 years old when he dies (25:7). Thus a full century of life in Canaan is credited to Abraham, with the supreme moment, the birth of Isaac, reached at the age of 100. To accommodate his chronological scheme, P has been forced occasionally to modify the story. In one instance noted, 21:14, he has done so by altering the word order of the text.

The most significant change made by P was his alteration of every reference to Abraham and Sarah prior to ch. 17 to read _Abram_ and _Sarai_. This was dictated by his desire to have them receive new names, full of significance, at the time of the making of the covenant in ch. 17. There is no other biblical evidence for the name Abram apart from two late notices in the work of the Chronicler (Neh. 9:7; I Ch. 1:27).

NOTES ON CHAPTER XII

[1] "The Haggada within Scripture," JBL, LXXX (1961), p. 120.

[2] "Re-examining the Foundations," JBL, LXXXIV (1965), p. 7.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 17.

[4] See also the comments by Julian Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," HUCA, XIV (1939), pp. 29-126. "For many and to me very cogent considerations I can not share in the opinion of practically all biblical scholars that the several J strata of Gen. 1-11 must necessarily be pre-exilic by virtue of their being indisputably a part of J. The assumption that all strata of J must be under all conditions pre-exilic and that the entire J school of writing came to an end with the Babylonian Exile or, as most scholars hold, even somewhat earlier, previous to the rise of the Deuteronomic school, is altogether gratuitous. There is not the slightest reason why the two schools may not have existed side by side for quite some time, and even have persisted into the post-exilic period, and even why the J school of thought and literary style should not have continued to express itself in the eschatological and apocalyptic writings of the third and second centuries B.C. and thereafter. At any rate, for compelling reasons I must assign the J strata in Gen. 1-11 to the universalistic period of Jewish thought and practice, 516-485 B.C., the period when the influence of North-Semitic religion and mythology pervaded Jewish thought, literature and religious practice" (pp. 93-94).

EXCURSUS

A SUMMARY OF C. J. DE CATANZARO, "A LITERARY ANALYSIS OF GENESIS I-XI," PH.D. THESIS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO (1957)

Although Genesis 1-11 is not part of the block of material investigated in the present thesis, it is desirable to have some discussion of critical views regarding these chapters. C. J. de Catanzaro has subjected Gen. 1-11 to critical investigation, and while the present writer is not prepared to defend all the details of de Catanzaro's analysis, he is willing to accept the general conclusions of his study. Since the thesis has not been published, a brief summary of de Catanzaro's main argument is presented here as an excursus.

Chapter I. The Literary Criticism of Genesis.

Chapter II. The Deluge and its Sequel (Genesis 6-9).

Genesis 6:9-22 is regarded by all critical scholars as forming a homogeneous block of material by the author customarily referred to as P. From this block de Catanzaro obtains a number of criteria which he subsequently uses to identify the presence of P material elsewhere.

Genesis 6:1-8 contrasts strongly in style, vocabulary and viewpoint with 6:9-22 and is manifestly of non-P authorship. It is customary to call this non-P material Yahwistic, or J, because of its employment of the divine name YHWH. Whether or not the Yahwistic material in the Primeval History is a literary unity has been a matter of dispute. Some scholars (notably Budde, Gunkel, Eissfeldt) believe that the narrative represents a conflation of two literary sources. Others, like C. A. Simpson, rely heavily on a theory of glossators to explain the presence of internal discrepancies. In the case of 6:1-8 de Catanzaro favors the view that the compiler drew on an oral tradition which was much more mythological in character. He has toned down this source and endeavoured to mould it to his purpose. In favor of the literary unity of vss. 1-8 is the fact that stylistic features connect vss. 1-4 with vss. 5-8. Thus vs. 5 presupposes the statement found in vss. 1-4, detailing the evil in mankind which finally provoked YHWH to take drastic action. To be noted also is the occurrence of the verbal root rbb in both vss. 1 and 5, and of the phrase "upon the surface of the ground" in vss. 1 and 7.

Two phrases in vs. 7 have been suspected of being P expansions: (a) אשר בראתי ; (b) מאדם עד־בהמה עד־רמש ועד־עוף השמים The former is suspect because ברא is found elsewhere in the Pentateuch only in P passages. But the occurrence of the verb in Amos 4:13 makes it difficult to maintain that the root would be unknown to J. As far as the other phrase is concerned, the fact that P makes a habit of cataloguing does not preclude moderate indulgence in this on the part of J. It is to be noted, too, that the structure of the catalogue in vs. 7 is different from that in vss. 18 and 20 in that it uses the construction מן...עד instead of straight co-ordination of members as in vs. 20. The list as it stands is therefore explicable by the logic of the section itself, and need not be taken as a gloss on the text.

By employing the criteria obtained from 6:9-22, de Catanzaro is able to ascribe other parts of the Story of the Deluge to P, viz. 7:6-7, 9a*, 10b-11, 13-16a, 17a-19, 20-21, 24; 8:1-2a, 3a*, 3b-5, 7(?), 13a, 14-19; 9:1-17, 19a, 28-29. His conclusions in this respect agree substantially with those of most critics. The principal disagreement among scholars has been over the listing of passages which are predominantly P but which contain reminiscences of J.

Genesis 7:1-5 is a J section which partially parallels the long P section (6:9-22) immediately preceding. It has no parallel, however, to the P account of the instructions regarding the building of the Ark (6:14 ff.). The likelihood is that J contained such an account but that it has been suppressed by P in favor of his own version. This view receives support from the observation that 7:1 is not a natural continuation of 6:8 (J). Something is obviously missing from J at this point.

The analysis of the sequel to the Flood Story (9:18-29) has been largely determined by the attitude taken to the problem presented by the fact that Canaan, not Ham, is the subject of the curse in vs. 25. Many scholars would omit the mention of Ham in vs. 22, thus making Canaan the transgressor, but there is no clear evidence in favor of such a deletion. De Catanzaro suggests that the curse is placed on Canaan because the author is interested only in those of Ham's descendants who inhabited Palestine. It is probable that in the original form of the tradition the curse fell on Ham, but the tradition has been modified by J to make it fit the context in which he wishes to place it. The story was manifestly derived from a different milieu than that in which the Flood Story circulated for there Noah's sons are mature, married men, whereas here they are mere boys. Here, as in 6:1-4, J has given an old story a new slant.

The main contributions of P to the story of the Deluge in its present form are the two long sections, 6:9-22 and 9:1-17. Both of these sections are primarily concerned with the relations of Noah with God. Not only is he the person whom God saves along with his family, he is the man with whom God concludes the covenant which henceforth governs post-diluvial society. Therefore Noah's relations with God must be such that God gave him full advance information about the forthcoming catastrophe, the measures whereby humanity was to be preserved and the animal kingdom renewed, and made him the agent whereby all this was achieved, and that further this advance information included an advance notice about the future covenant (6:18). Now both the righteous character of Noah on the background of general sinfulness, and his function in co-operation with God are implied in J (6:8; 7:1-5), as also something in the way of a covenant after the end of the Deluge (8:20-22), but P heavily underscores these elements. These two long notes would seem to have been added by way of commentary on the rather short J sections corresponding to them.

This raises the issue of whether J, as maintained by many scholars, was added to an already existing P, or whether P was added to J. The structure of the Deluge narrative seems to de Catanzaro to favor the latter alternative. He believes that if P was the basis to which J was added, 6:9-11 would have come before 6:1-8; in other words, the Story of the Deluge would have been framed in the Toledoth of Noah. As it is, it would seem that it was the mention of Noah in 6:8 (J) which gave rise to the insertion of Noah's Toledoth.

The shorter bits of P in chs. 7-8 are of such a character that they may be considered as annotations on, and expansions of, the already existing J narrative. That P in his work of reshaping the narrative made use of other pre-existing materials besides J is not improbable.

Chapter III. The Creation Story (1:1-2:4a).

Critics are virtually unanimous in assigning this section to P because of its style and terminology, its systematic schematized structure and its point of view. However, the fact that eight creative acts have been squeezed into a six-day period and the fact that creation sometimes takes place by divine fiat, sometimes by direct act, has led some scholars to the belief that P based his narrative on older literary sources. Budde believed that P made use of a creation story from J2. Von Rad sees a combination of two P sources: P^A (an older story of creation by a series of acts--a Tatbericht) and P^B (a later story of creation by fiat, a Befehlsbericht). The assumption that a narrative of creation by means of divine command is later than a creation by divine acts is, however, disproved by references to Akkadian and Egyptian myths. Both conceptions are found quite early.

Traces of an earlier mythology are to be found in P's references to the primeval chaos תהו ובהו and to תהום , to the תנינם and to darkness being on the face of the deep, but these references provide no real help for literary analysis. The theory that a basic narrative has been expanded by glosses can also be dismissed since the presumed glosses can be readily explained from P's tendency to redundancy.

De Catanzaro regards 2:4a as composed by P to serve as an introduction to the J material beginning with vs. 4b. He favors the belief of many scholars that a J Creation Story once stood at this point but was suppressed by P in favor of his own cosmogony.

Chapter IV. The Paradise Story (2:4b-3:24).

The language, style and outlook of this story contrast sharply with those of P. A prominent feature of the narrative is the employment of the compound divine name YHWH Elohim. (YHWH never occurs alone, while Elohim occurs in isolation four times, all within 3:1-5). This led Budde to believe that the narrative represents a combination of two recensions of the same story, one of which employed YHWH exclusively, the other Elohim exclusively. Gunkel accepted this hypothesis but renamed the sources Jj and Je. Pfeiffer, who denied the existence of J in the Primeval History, ascribed the bulk of the story to his S Document (of presumed Edomite provenance), and 2:10-14 to S^2 (a midrash on S), both being introduced into the Pentateuch after P. Mowinckel and Hölscher believed the sources to be J and E. Humbert rejects the idea of literary sources and believes the story represents a fusion of two myths, a Creation Myth and a Paradise Myth. Von Rad also stresses the unity of the story in its present form, as had Gunkel.

The geographical note in 2:10-14 has been regarded as a later insertion because it is out of keeping with the simplicity of the rest of the narrative and because it interrupts the flow of the narrative. It is certainly a digression but the manner in which the thread, dropped in vs. 9, is taken up again in vss. 15-16 suggests that the digression is due to J himself. A later glossator would probably not have been so careful to employ the compound divine name and to have resumed and expanded the statement in vs. 5 about man's function in the Garden. The digression may well be an attempt on J's part to de-mythologize the Garden by giving it a definite geographical location.

As far as Humbert's theory is concerned, the Garden theme is found in vss. 16, 17 and 25, the Creation theme in vss. 18-24 but no difference in style and vocabulary between the two parts is discernible. Thus, even if two separate myths have been merged, the story in its present literary form is to be regarded as of single authorship.

Attempts have been made to use the mention of the two trees as a basis for source analysis. It has been pointed out that the Tree of Life is mentioned in 2:19 but plays no further part in the story till 3:22. De Catanzaro argues that this by no means implies the use of two sources by the author. It is clear that he was mainly interested in the Tree of Knowledge, since it was more integral to his purpose. He was, however, conversant with the older form of the myth in which the Tree of Life figured prominently and did not wish to discard it entirely.

So he brings in the Tree of Life near the beginning as part of the traditional description of the Garden and returns to it at the end, in the latter case somewhat clumsily, but still managing to make it fit in with his general theme. There is no need to assume, with Humbert, that these stories existed separately in written form. All stylistic indications point to unity of authorship. A fuller treatment of the problem posed by the compound divine name YHWH Elohim is presented in an excursus at the end of the thesis where the view is adopted that when P prefaced his own Creation Story (which employed Elohim) to the J narrative (which employed YHWH), he felt it desirable to soften the transition by inserting Elohim after YHWH in the J account. Having once begun to add it, he could find no suitable place to break off before the end of ch. 3.

Chapter V. The Cainite Cycle (ch. 4).

This chapter is clearly composed of disparate elements. The story of the murder of Cain by his brother Abel fits badly into its present context. The condemnation of Cain in vs. 12 to be "a fugitive and wanderer in the earth" ill fits the statement that Cain built a city (vs. 17). The statement in vs. 15 about the purpose of Cain's mark hardly fits the context of the creation and paradise story of chs. 2-3, according to which Cain would be unlikely to find any people on earth besides his immediate kin. In vs. 25 it is stated that the cult of YHWH began in the days of Enosh, whereas vss. 3-5 tell of Cain and his brother offering sacrifices to Yahweh.

The attempts of Budde, Gunkel, Smend, Eissfeldt, Skinner, etc. to explain these discrepancies by a theory of documentary admixture are not fully convincing. Von Rad recognizes the discrepancies but denies that they presuppose literary sources. He looks on the chapter as produced by J out of oral traditions of diverse origin, which to some extent had coalesced before his time. The chapter shows several evidences of internal connection. Thus vs. 2 presupposes vs. 1, and vs. 1 in turn is connected with vs. 3. Verse 17 has close literary affinities to vs. 1, while 17b is parallel in structure to 2b. Furthermore, the story of the fratricide (vss. 1-16) bears many marks of literary affinity with the preceding Paradise Story. The resemblances, as listed by de Catanzaro, are so close and so striking that, whatever be the separate origins of the stories, there can be no doubt that in their present literary form they come from the same hand.

The literary style of the Sethite genealogy (vss. 25-26) is of a piece with the rest of the chapter. Verse 25 resembles vss. 1 and 17; there is the same play on words in the naming of the child. Verse 26 contains the expression גם־הוא ילד , to be compared with גם־הוא ילדה in vs. 22. The presence of *Elohim* in vs. 25 does not imply a non-J source in view of the assertion in vs. 26. Verses 25-26 are undoubtedly a fragment of a longer J genealogy which has been amputated at this point to allow for the inclusion of the ampler P genealogy in ch. 5.

Whatever be the diversities of the chapter, all of it, except the last two verses, centres on the personality of Cain. Around this figure several originally disparate elements have clustered. A unity of style runs through the various parts suggesting unity of authorship rather than the weaving together of separate literary sources by a redactor. A written source may underlie vss. 17-24 but even this section bears the imprint of J's style. In theme the author has managed to give the material a definite slant of his own. There is first of all the aetiological interest which he may have inherited from his oral sources, and which gives us a picture of the development of mankind, agriculture and nomadism, the building of cities, the addition of further crafts and occupations. But there is the deeper ideological or theological interest. Concurrent with his view of human "progress", he has a view of man plunging himself deeper and deeper into iniquity and alienation from God. In the story of Cain the murderer and the blasphemous Lamech he prepares for the scene of destruction which he is about to paint in the Story of the Deluge. The ancient myths have been transformed and made the bearers of ideas which were certainly foreign to them originally.

Chapter VI. The Sethite Genealogy (ch. 5).

This chapter is regarded by all critics as the work of P, with the exception of vs. 29, and possibly the last word of vs. 28, which are assigned to J. De Catanzaro agrees that vs. 29 is a fragment of J's Sethite genealogy, the beginning of which is found in 4:25-26. He is also favorably inclined towards von Rad's theory that P here made use of a Book of Toledoth.

Chapter VII. The Table of Nations (ch. 10).

Scholars are generally agreed that the chapter is a mixture of J and P elements. There is some difference of opinion, however, regarding the homogeneity of the J sections. Gunkel distributes them among his Jj and Je documents. Skinner, Eissfeldt and Procksch assign several passages to glossators.

The list as at present constituted falls into three clearly marked sections: (i) the sons of Japheth (vss. 2-4), (ii) the sons of Ham (vss. 6-19), (iii) the sons of Shem (vss. 21-30). Verse 1, which serves as a general introduction to the whole Table, is recognized to be the work of P. Verses 5, 20 and 31, which serve as summaries at the end of each section, are also recognized to be the work of P. Verse 32 is P's general conclusion to the whole Table.

Scholars are agreed in attributing section (ii) (vss. 6-19), the sons of Ham) and section (iii) (vss. 21-30, the sons of Shem) to J, but they doubt that either is a homogeneous unit. Verse 6 is usually assigned to P but it contains none of the characteristic marks of P; hence, as far as style goes, it may equally well be by J. Moreover, it seems needed as a heading for the material in vss. 8-19. Verse 7 exhibits no marks of P either but since it appears to intrude between vss. 6 and 8 and contradicts vss. 28-29 de Catanzaro assigns it to P. The different format of vss. 16-18--a list of nomina gentilica in contrast to the personal names preceding--has led Eissfeldt and Procksch to regard these verses as secondary. The employment of the tribal names may, however, be due simply to the fact that these peoples had no eponymous ancestor known to J.

It is customary to assign section (i) (vss. 2-4, the sons of Japheth) to P but the verses exhibit none of the characteristics of P's style and may well be J. Simons regards the names Madai and Lud as later insertions into the list, but, as de Catanzaro points out, it would be extremely difficult to find any objective criterion to distinguish secondary from original names in such lists. He suggests that the mention of the Medes and the absence of any reference to the Persians may be an indication of the date of the list, namely, the period of the Median empire. His own analysis of the chapter is as follows:

J--vss. 2-4, 6, 8-19, 21*, 22-30;
P--vss. 1, 5, 7(?), 20, 21*, 31-32.

Chapter VIII. The Tower of Babel (11:1-9).

The literary unity of the narrative has been maintained by Budde, Eissfeldt and Pfeiffer. Gunkel, however, believed that the present story is a conflation of two elements: a Turmbaurezension and a Stadtbaurezension. Cassuto points out that Gunkel's antithesis of city and tower is a false one, in that the construction of a city would not in itself constitute the act of hybris against the Deity. Furthermore, the verses detached by Gunkel to form a separate narrative are complementary to the ones which remain after their removal; in fact, without them the narrative lacks any clear point.

The chief grounds for the theory of dual sources are the seeming doublets, vss. 5, 7, 8 and 9. In vs. 5 it is said that Yahweh went down to see what was going on, while in vs. 7 he says, "Come let us go down." But the same phenomenon, where we find an anticipation of what is described more closely in the sequel, is found in Genesis 37:21 (cf. also 27:23-26 and 32:23-24). The doublet, vss. 8-9, presents no problem once it is recognized that vs. 9 is J's reflective comment upon the story which he has been telling. Thus there are insufficient grounds for suspecting the literary unity of the narrative.

The story fits ill, however, with the Nimrod section (10:8-12) of the preceding narrative where Babylon and other Mesopotamian cities are mentioned. The reference in 10:25 to Peleg, in whose time the earth was divided, also points to a different tradition about the dispersal of mankind. Yet the suffix of בנסעם (vs. 2) seems to refer back to the nations mentioned in ch. 10, showing that the Tower of Babel Story presupposes that chapter. It would appear that traditions of different origin have been linked together.

Chapter IX. The Shemite and Terahite Genealogies (11:10-32).

These genealogies form the link between the Primeval History and the Abraham legend. Their resemblance to other P passages, notably ch. 5, stamps them as the work of the P author. However, one section, vss. 28-31, does not conform to the stereotyped pattern elsewhere employed and vss. 28-30, at least, are attributed to J, with the exception of the words אור כשדים at the end of vs. 28. Gunkel and Simpson regard them as a later insertion on the ground that J thinks of Abraham's home as Aram-naharaim (see 24:10). Procksch would retain the words, maintaining that J knew of two conflicting traditions regarding Abraham's place of origin, and regards the excision of the words as gratuitous. De Catanzaro agrees that there are no adequate grounds for regarding the words as a later insertion. He suggests that the mention of the Chaldeans may be an indication of the relatively late date of J, in that they are mentioned first in II Kings 24:2, after Nebuchadrezzar appears in Palestine, and in prophetic passages contemporary with that event and later.

In spite of the fact that vs. 31 does not conform to the stereotyped pattern employed elsewhere by P in this chapter, most scholars assign it to P. Here, Terah takes the initiative, whereas in 12:1 the initiative is Abraham's, although in obediance to a divine command. Haran is here merely a place on the way to Canaan. De Catanzaro would assign vs. 31 to J, except for the phrase "to go to the land of Canaan", since it seems out of harmony with the statement that "they settled there" (at Haran). He regards the phrase as an annotation by P in anticipation of ch. 12.

Chapter X. J and P in the Primeval History.

The investigation confirms the traditional division of the Primeval History into two strands, J and P, as being reasonable and consonant with the facts. On the other hand, reasons have been found for dissenting from certain views common among literary critics. These are not matters merely of the ascription of material to one or other of the literary strands, but of the relationship between these strands to each other, as well as their fundamental nature.

With respect to the relationship between J and P, the common assumption that these are parallel one to the other appears to be erroneous. It would seem that the relationship is much simpler than that envisaged by the documentary hypothesis in its conventional form, in that P is best regarded as supplementary to J. On this basis, passages variously explained as redactional additions or glosses are readily explained as belonging to one or other of the main strands.

Certain traditions found in J obviously come from different backgrounds, e.g., the Cainite Cycle and the Story of the Deluge, but in no case has it been necessary to explain internal discrepancies by resorting to a theory of different literary sources. The discrepancies are explainable by pre-literary factors. While there are very few links between the various units of J, the unity of style is noticeable. This appears to substantiate the theory of von Rad that the author of J was working with separate oral traditions which he was the first to join together. Thus they cohere, less by being mutually adapted to each other than by the order in which they have been placed, an order which has been conditioned by the author's theology and by the special theological ideas which he wishes to convey. The coherence of the J document is destroyed by any attempt to interfere with it by subtracting any of its links, nor have the links thus subtracted any obvious interconnection as against the remainder.

The sections which have been assigned to J1 by some scholars are as follows:

(a) parts of the Paradise Story, 2-3;
(b) the Cainite genealogy, 4:1, 17-24;
(c) the Nephilim, 6:1-4;
(d) the story of Noah the viticulturist, 9:18-27;
(e) the tower of Babel, 9:1-9.

But none of these has anything in common with the others. Such coherence as they possess seems due to the form which J superimposed upon them.

The alleged J2 sections are as follows:

(a) parts of the Paradise Story, 2-3;
(b) Cain's fratricide, 4:2-16;
(c) the Sethite fragment, 4:25-26;
(d) the naming of Noah, 5:29;

(e) the J parts of the Story of the Deluge, 6-8;

(f) the J parts of the Table of Nations, 10;

(g) the J parts of the Terahite genealogy, 11:28-30.

A gap in J2 appears in the lack of explicit information on the immediate provocation for the Deluge, as well as the growth of evil on the earth. This is admirably filled by the alleged J1 pieces of the Cainite genealogy and the Nephilim.

Thus the disconnected fragments usually assigned to J1 are not intelligible as a separate document, but if they and the fragments assigned to J2 are considered as parts of a single J, each piece falls into its place. Furthermore, no stylistic evidence was found to support the theory of two J sources.

The J material contains a few indications of its date: the rise of great kingdoms is explicitly connected in 10:8-12 with Mesopotamia, with the implication that the great power of the writer's own day had its centre in that area. The Babel Story, too, indicates some knowledge of conditions there. The terms used to describe Mesopotamia, ארץ שנער (10:10; 11:2) and כשדים (11:28, 31) are of late occurrence apart from the Pentateuch. The former term appears in exilic and post-exilic material, the latter begins to appear with the rise of Chaldean power. The Medes are mentioned in 10:2 but significantly there is no mention of the Persians. The fact that the Chronicler knows the terms פרס and פרסי may suggest that in Hebrew usage, unlike that of the Greeks and Arabs, the Persians were not included under the name of the Medes. This would seem to preclude a date in the Persian period, though it would be possible to argue from the favorable attitude to Japheth in 9:26-27 that the Persians had recently overthrown the Babylonians. To attempt an exact dating is precarious, but the above indications suggest a date no earlier than the reign of Josiah, preferably after the resumption of Babylonian independence in 625, and not much later than the Persian conquest of Babylon in 539, if that late.

De Catanzaro's conclusion is that as far as literary analysis is concerned, J is a unified document within the Primeval History, and the work of one author. The evidences for multiplicity within J point, not to duality or plurality of literary sources, but to a multiplicity of oral traditions. Some of these had probably coalesced before the author became acquainted with them but their present unity derives from his hand. The J Primeval History has been constructed by him on a single theological outline--creation, fall, increase of evil, punishment, election of a new ancestor for mankind and the establishment of a new mankind, a renewed act of sin and punishment, all held together by various genealogies, and fulfilling the function of a preface to the Abraham Cycle.

Two excurses are appended to the thesis:

A. The Divine Names in the Primeval History;

B. The Chronology of the Deluge.

PART III THE STORY OF JACOB

I GENESIS 25:19-34

Vss. 19-20. Introduction.

These verses are assigned to P by all critics for the following reasons: (i) the "toledoth" formula (cf. previously in Genesis 2:4a; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10, 27; 25:12); (ii) the chronological interest; (iii) the expression פדן ארם; (iv) the verb ילד used in the Hiph'il. The evidence is sufficient to warrant such an assignment.

Vss. 21-24. The birth of the twins, Esau and Jacob.

The statement in vs. 24 that twins were in the womb of Rebekah is redundant after the statement in vss. 22-23 that two nations were in her womb. It should be noted as well that vs. 24 forms the natural sequel to vs. 21, strengthening the view that this section is composite. Procksch and Simpson have noted this problem and have attempted solutions along different lines. Procksch assigned vss. 21-23 to J, vss. 24 ff. to E. Simpson considers vss. 21 and 24 to be J1, while vss. 22-23 are a J2 addition to the earlier account (see App. D).

It has been noted that vs. 24 forms a natural sequel to vs. 21, which would favor Simpson's solution. The divine name YHWH is found in vss. 21, 22, 23; if vss. 22-23 and vs. 21 are of diverse authorship it follows that both writers favor the same divine name. This fact is reminiscent of the situation noted in ch. 12:1-4. There, too, a basic J account was amplified by a second writer using the divine name YHWH (see above, pp. 28-29). As in 12:1-4, where the destiny of Abraham's seed is predicted, so here the destiny of Isaac's descendants is spelled out in advance. Esau (the Edomites) will be subject to Jacob (the Israelites). Similar decrees concerning the fate of individuals and nations have been shown above to occur in later passages: cf. the future in store for man, woman and the serpent in 2:14-19, for the Canaanites, Japhethites and Shemites in 9:25-27, and for the Ishmaelites in 16:12.

An examination of the vocabulary of vss. 22-23 reveals one link with C material identified in the Abraham Story, viz., מעיך (vs. 23, cf. 15:4). The word לאם, found in vs. 23, is called "chiefly late" by Brown, Driver and Briggs, who also note that only here and in Isa. 51:4 does it refer to Israel.[1] There is thus some indication that the editorial activity of C continues into the Jacob Story.

Simpson has suggested that J2 inserted רבקה in vs. 21b, on the ground that had the name been original in J1 it would have been used in the "a" part of the verse. This leads him to the further view that J1 had no record of the name of Isaac's wife, nor any story of their marriage.[2] Such a view is highly improbable. It is true that the expression "his wife" in vs. 21a demands a previous mention of Rebekah and of Isaac's marriage to her, and there can be little doubt that the J1 narrative included such a note. This was suppressed, however, by P in favor of his own account (vs. 20).

Vss. 25-28. The origin of the names Esau and Jacob.

Esau is said to have come forth from the womb "red" (אדמוני), a manifest play on Esau's role as the ancestor of the Edomites and on the meaning of Edom ("Red Land", so-called because of its red sandstone). He also looked like a coat of "hair" (שער), pointing to the connection of Esau and the Edomites with Mt. Seir (שעיר), as is made explicit in Gen. 36:8, for example, וישב עשו בהר שעיר עשו הוא אדום.[3]

The presence of two etymologies has prompted most critics to regard them as doublets and to derive them from different sources. Procksch, who regarded vss. 25-26 as basically E, assigned כלו כאדרת שער to that source, while אדמוני was attributed to J. On the other hand, Simpson, who regarded the verses as basically J1, called אדמוני a gloss (see App. D).

Similarly, the description of the young men in vss. 27-28 has given rise to attempts to distinguish two writers. Procksch regarded איש שדה as E's variant to the J expression איש ידע ציד. Simpson assigned the latter expression to J2. The expressions איש תם and ישב אהלים (vs. 27) were also regarded as doublets. Gunkel assigned איש תם to J, and ישב אהלים to E. Procksch reversed the order, while Simpson called ישב באהלים a gloss on איש תם.[4]

These attempts rest upon the *a priori* assumptions that two entire and parallel accounts existed, and that a writer would not resort to more than one etymology in a given situation. Both of these assumptions need to be questioned. The analysis of the Abraham Story has shown that the theory of independent parallel sources is there untenable. It is, unlikely, therefore, that such a theory should be adopted in this instance unless the evidence in favor of such a view is substantial. There is no reason why a Hebrew writer should have restricted himself to one terse expression in describing his characters. Moreover, the employment of two descriptive terms is in keeping with the Hebrew use of parallelism and does not necessarily imply the presence of parallel strands. Etymologies of different origins have been merged in such a way that all possible light may be shed on a particular name or custom. Even if the various elements were separate in an oral stage of transmission, it does not follow that the examples provide proof of composite literary structure.[5]

Apart from vs. 26b, which because of its chronological interest is universally assigned to P (see App. D), vss. 25-28 appear to come from one hand. Simpson assigns vs. 28 to J2 on the ground that it does not contribute to the story but merely prepares the way for ch. 27 (see App. D). However, in its present position the verse helps to paint the background of subsequent events and contributes to a fuller picture of the rivalry which existed between the brothers, and which involved the parents as well. There is, therefore, no good reason why vss. 25, 26a, 27-28 should not be assigned to the same writer as vss. 21 and 24, i.e., the basic J source.

Vss. 29-34. Esau sells his birthright.

Apart from a few expressions, the unity of this passage is seldom questioned. Strangely enough, critics have failed to reach any agreement on the source to which the verses are to be assigned. Gunkel and Procksch assigned the episode to E, Eissfeldt to L, while Simpson called it J1 (see App. D). Their views are dictated by their analysis of ch. 27, as well as by their view of vss. 24 ff. For example, Gunkel noted that the word שדה is mentioned in vs. 29, therefore since איש שדה (vs. 27) is E, and since 27:36 is E, vss. 29-34 must also be from E.[6]

Simpson's attempt to remove vss. 30b and 34b from the original story (see App. D) is unconvincing. It is doubtful if vs. 30 is to be understood as offering another etymology of the name Edom. Rather, it is a play on the name. As noted above, the addition of further traditional material is not necessarily proof that more than one writer was involved in the production of a story. While vs. 34b appears to be a summary of the entire story, there is no good reason why the original writer might not have wished to summarize his account in this fashion. Thus, vss. 29-34 may be regarded as part of the basic narrative.

In summary, the literary structure of the first episode of the Jacob Story may be tabulated as follows:

J--vss. 21, 24, 26a, 27-34;
C--vss. 22-23;
P--vss. 19-20, 26b.

NOTES ON CHAPTER I

[1] *BDB*, p. 522.

[2] *ETI*, p. 93.

[3] In view of the fact that an etymology for "Jacob" is suggested in vs. 26, it seems likely that the reference to שער is intended to offer some etymological information not only for Seir, but also for Esau (עשו). Such an etymology on first glance appears to be forced and quite unnatural, but it is possible that the name was originally based on the root *ʿaṯā*, from which the Arabic *'aʿṯā*, "hairy" is derived. Since this root was not used in Hebrew, the writer had to use a Hebrew root which had the same meaning, namely *śʿr*.

[4] Cf. G. R. Driver, *JTS*, XXXI (1930), p. 281, who derives this expression from תים "domesticated, stay at home", a root not found elsewhere in the Old Testament. Followed by Simpson, *ETI*, p. 93.

[5] Cf. Volz, *Der Elohist*, pp. 70-73.

[6] *Genesis*, p. 297.

II GENESIS 26

This chapter, containing most of the extant traditional material concerning Isaac, is generally regarded as the work of J, to which considerable later redactional material has been added (see App. D).

Vss. 1-11. *Rebekah and Abimelech*.

It is generally believed that vs. $1a^b$ is an attempt by a redactor to harmonize this story with the similar tale concerning Abraham and Sarah (12:10-20). However, this note need be regarded as redactional only if it is assumed that ch. 26 gives an earlier form of the tale than that presented in ch. 12. On the other hand, if the writer of ch. 26 was familiar with the story in 12:10-20, it is quite possible that he harmonized the two accounts himself.

Simpson assigns fragments of vs. 2 to J1, J2 and a later redactor (see App. D). He feels that the reference to going down to Egypt because of a famine is another attempt at harmonization with ch. 12:10 ff.[1] This view is based on the same assumption noted in connection with vs. 1 and can only be fully discussed after the relationship of this chapter to Gen. 12 has been determined.

Wellhausen was aware of the late character of vss. 1-5, therefore he assigned them entirely to a redactor, and had the J story begin with vs. 6.[2] Holzinger detected Deuteronomic coloring in vss. 3-5.[3] Gunkel and Procksch assigned vss. 3b-5 to a Deuteronomic redactor. Simpson, who agrees with this, would also call vs. 2b Deuteronomic. It should be noted that these verses are reminiscent of the divine promises met in C material in the Abraham Story. With vs. 3, relating the promise of the land to Abraham's seed, compare 12:2-3; 13:14-17; 15:18; 24:7 (all attributed to C). The oath to Abraham refers back to ch. 15 (C). The promise of innumerable descendants (vs. 4) recalls 13:16; 15:5; 16:10; 22:17 (all C). The presence of Deuteronomic expressions משמרתי,

מצותי , חקותי ותורתי in vs. 5 is not an argument against C authorship, since a small amount of Deuteronomic coloring has already been found in ch. 15 and in 18:19, which were assigned to C.

Several expressions in vss. 1-5 point to C authorship, and reinforce the view put forward tentatively in dealing with 25:22-23 that evidence of the editorial activity of C is to be found beyond the limits of the Abraham Story: (i) the verb שכן (vs. 2) which is found only in C material in Genesis (see App. B); (ii) the Hithpa'el of ברך (vs. 4), also in 22:18, comprising all the occurrences in Genesis; elsewhere it is found in Deut. 29:18; Isa. 65:16, 16; Jer. 4:2; Ps. 74:17; (iii) the expression ככוכבי השמים (vs. 4) which was found in 22:17 (C) and is also used in late material, cf. Ex. 32:13; Deut. 1:10; 10:22; 28:62; Neh. 9:23; I Ch. 27:27. In view of the evidence noted above it would appear that vss. 1-5 should be assigned to C. Smend's proposal that part of vss. 3b-5 should be assigned to E,[4] a view expanded by Eissfeldt who assigns all of vss. 3b^{b}-5a to E (see App. D), must be rejected unless clear evidence is found of the existence of an E version of the Isaac Story.

It is universally agreed that vss. 6-11 are a unity, although Simpson assigns the name "Rebekah" in vs. 8 to J2 in keeping with his theory that J1 was not acquainted with her name (see above on 25:21).

The crucial problem presented by ch. 26 is whether its story about Rebekah and Abimelech is modelled on either or both of the similar stories in chs. 12 and 20, or whether they are modelled on it. Smend declared, "Ohne Frage ist 26^{1-11} die ältere der beiden Versionen."[5] He pointed to the simplicity of the account in ch. 26; Abimelech is merely a petty ruler of the area in which Isaac lived, whereas in the story in 12:10 ff. the foreign ruler is king of all Egypt. Also, the treatment accorded Isaac and Rebekah by Abimelech when he learned that he had been deceived (vss. 10-11) is more realistic than is the granting of lavish gifts by Pharaoh.[6] In spite of the fact that many critics accept this view, the argument is not totally convincing. Skinner has argued that ch. 26 is actually "the most colourless and least original form of the tradition."[7] Thus, Abimelech shows no interest whatsoever in Rebekah; it is "the men of the place" who inquire of Isaac and who are told that she is his sister. Later, when Rebekah's identity is discovered and Abimelech is indignant, since shame might have been brought upon the people had they acted foolishly, it is immediately apparent that they had not acted in such a way, and that Rebekah had not been assaulted. The story is not only colourless; it is entirely pointless unless the reader is also aware of the other versions of this tale. Only when both chs. 12 and 20 are brought to mind can a reader sense the full purpose of the writer of ch. 26.[8] The chronological order of the three related stories would thus be: (i) 12:10-20; (ii) 20:1-17; (iii) 26:6-11. There is no doubt that Skinner's arguments possess considerable force.

It is likely, therefore, that vss. 6-11, like vss. 1-5, should be assigned to C. Note the expression טובת מראה (vs. 7) as in 24:16 (C); J employed יפת־מראה in 12:11. C prepared for his version of the story by having Isaac move into Abimelech's territory, just as Abraham was shifted to Gerar by the E author of ch. 20. However, C's story about Rebekah and Abimelech has no apparent apologetic purpose, as had E's. It seems to be merely part of his attempt to create a full-fledged Isaac legend.

Vss. 12-22. *Isaac expelled from Gerar*. *Three wells discovered*.

While living at Gerar, Isaac became so prosperous that he aroused the jealousy of his Philistine neighbors and Abimelech asked him to leave the city. He did so and encamped in the Wadi (*naḥal*) Gerar. There a controversy broke out concerning the ownership of certain wells, with the result that they came to be called *Esek*, meaning "contention", and *Sitnah*, meaning "enmity". Since YHWH provided space for Isaac in another area, a third well was called *Rehoboth*, meaning "room". Most critics assign these verses to the same hand as the preceding section, but attribute vss. 15 and 18 to a redactor who attempted to harmonize the story with 21:25-32 which ascribed the discovery and naming of these wells to Abraham (see App. D). It is usually assumed that the tradition in vss. 19-22 about Isaac's discovery of the three wells in the Negeb is a J parallel to the E tradition in 21:25-32 and that vss. 15 and 18 are an editorial attempt to harmonize the two traditions. However, the idea that the stories are parallel is without foundation since 21:25-32 refers to the digging and naming of a single well, that at Beersheba. Nevertheless, 26:15, 18 do suggest that a tradition about the discovery of the three wells once existed in the J story of Abraham, or in the E supplement to it--more likely in the latter since apparently it alone recorded a movement of Abraham away from Hebron. This tradition has been shifted by C to the Isaac Story. He probably felt that it was more appropriate to link the name of Isaac with these wells since they were located in the vicinity of Beersheba, a region with which the figure of Isaac was especially associated. Furthermore, such a transfer helped to fill out the Isaac legend, meagre enough at best. C pays lip-service at least to the earlier tradition which attributed the discovery of the wells to Abraham.

There is one word in this section which suggests C authorship, namely, the verb עתק (vs. 22) which is used elsewhere in Genesis only in 12:8, which was assigned to C. There are also two indications of a late date: (i) the term שערים (vs. 12), probably derived from a root meaning "to calculate, reckon",[9] which is found elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Prov. 23:7, but which is common in post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic; (ii) the root סתם (vss. 15, 18), used in the Piel only in this chapter, but other themes of the verb are common in the late period (cf. II Ch. 32:3, 4, 30; Dan. 8:26; 12:4, 9; Ps. 51:8; Neh. 4:1, etc.).

Vss. 23-25. The theophany at Beersheba.

These verses are customarily assigned, in whole or in part, to a secondary hand by critics (see App. D). Gunkel argued that the verses disrupt the connection between vss. 22 and 26.[10] Procksch, however, denied their secondary character and suggested that they are a free composition based on previous J promises.[11] There are several indications that they are by C: (i) וברכתיך (vs. 24, cf. vs. 3 above); (ii) "I will make your seed abundant" (vs. 24, cf. the discussion of vss. 3-5 above); (iii) ויקרא בשם יהוה (vs. 25, cf. App. B). In vs. 24 Abraham is called "my servant", a term not used of Abraham elsewhere in Genesis. The concept is found, however, in the exilic period (see Isa. 41:8).

Instead of disrupting the flow of the narrative, these verses introduce an episode of considerable importance to the author. The basis of Isaac's prosperity is clearly set forth and, in the process, Isaac is firmly connected with Beersheba. It was noted above (see pp. 81-82) that E brought Abraham to Beersheba but vss. 23-25 make it plain that C regarded Isaac as the founder of the shrine at Beersheba. This helps to explain why C attributes to Isaac several of the adventures ascribed to Abraham in the Negeb by E. Without denying the traditional connection between Abraham and the Negeb, he tries to show that Isaac was the primary founder and patron of the Beersheba sanctuary.

Vss. 26-33. How Beersheba got its name.

Once more a story similar to one related by E (21:23-32) is found. A covenant is consummated (vss. 28, 31) as in the former account (21:31-32) and an etymology provided for the name Beersheba. The E story related a two-fold explanation for the origin of the place-name (see above, pp. 77-78); so here, the name is associated with the idea of "swearing" (vs. 31), and also of "abundance?".[12]

There is no evidence which would preclude assigning this episode to the same source as vss. 1-25, namely, C. The writer is careful not to contradict the E story, but he is insistent in claiming Beersheba for Isaac.

Vss. 34-35. Esau's wives.

The list of Esau's wives in vss. 34-35 is universally recognized by critics as the work of P (see App. D). The reasons advanced are: (i) the interest in chronology (vs. 34); (ii) the reference to the inhabitants of southern Canaan as Hittites, cf. ch. 23. For the differences between this list and that in 36:2-3, see the discussion of the latter below.

The original location of ch. 26.

Since in 26:7 Rebekah is described as an attractive woman, it has been common since Hupfeld's time to suggest that the Isaac Story must have originally preceded 25:21 ff. where Rebekah is the mother of grown-up sons.[13] A similar problem is presented by the E narrative in ch. 20 where Sarah is depicted as a beautiful woman, although according to the J account in 18:11 she was well advanced in years. The answer to this problem is not to be found in rearranging the material, but in recognizing that the two passages come from different hands.

If the view suggested above is correct, namely, that 26:1-33 is the work of C, it is obvious that this is the best place in which such a collection of stories could be inserted. Isaac is an old and feeble man in ch. 27, therefore any significant activity on his part must be noted prior to that chapter. On the other hand, 25:21 ff. deals with the birth and youth of Isaac's children. It is unlikely that C would see fit to postpone the birth of Isaac's children until the present chapter was related, nor would he wish to break up ch. 25 by inserting ch. 26 after the children had been born but before they grow up.

The place of Isaac in the Patriarchal traditions.

The figure of Isaac in the Genesis stories is at best a shadowy one. Apart from ch. 26, he appears in no significant role. Although the child of promise, his role in the story of the test of Abraham's faith (ch. 22) is entirely passive. In ch. 24 he is of no consequence whatsoever, while in ch. 25 he is introduced as the father of twins and then completely ignored. His role in ch. 27 is far from glorious. As a helpless old man, who apparently favored the wrong son and loved good food, he is tricked into conferring his blessing on the younger son. In other words, in the J narrative Isaac merely serves as little more than a connecting link between Abraham and Jacob.

It is usually assumed that Isaac must have enjoyed considerable importance in the tradition since he ranks as one of the three great patriarchs. Yet apart from the formula "the god of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,"[14] he is hardly mentioned in the Old Testament apart from Abraham. In fact, in only two references does he stand alone, viz., Amos 7:9, 16 (note even here the different spelling, ישחק). Despite the attempts of some critics to emphasize the importance of Isaac as a transmitter of the promise,[15] his role in Genesis and in the Old Testament generally is a minor one.[16]

NOTES ON CHAPTER II

[1] *ETI*, p. 92.

[2] *Die Composition*, p. 23.

[3] *Genesis*, p. 176.

[4] *Die Erzählung*, p. 54.

[5] *Ibid*., p. 52.

[6] *Ibid*., pp. 52-53.

[7] *Genesis*, p. 365.

[8] Cf. E. Speiser, "The Wife-Sister Motif in the Patriarchal Narratives," *Biblical and Other Studies*, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 15-28, who rejects such a view, stating that the stories are "not only repetitive in their present form; they are also mutually incompatible when analyzed side by side." P. 16.

[9] *BDB*, p. 1045.

[10] *Genesis*, p. 303.

[11] *Die Genesis*, p. 160.

[12] The textual evidence from the Versions is important here in attempting to determine the original text at this point. From a literary point of view it is significant that a second etymology is attempted, the precise meaning of which is unclear, although "abundance" (שבע) would be an appropriate comment following the discovery of water.

[13] *Die Quellen*, p. 155; Dillmann, *Die Genesis*, p. 323; Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, p. 28.

[14] Cf. Hoftijzer, *Die Verheissungen*.

[15] Cf. L. Hicks, "Isaac," *IDB*, II, pp. 728-729.

[16] Cf. the detailed study by Willy Staerk, *Studien zur Religions- und Sprachgeschichte des alten Testaments*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Reimer, 1899), pp. 59-62.

III GENESIS 27

Since the time of Wellhausen critics have confidently detected parallel strands in this chapter.[1] Although some scholars have expressed scepticism concerning the possibility of being able to distinguish two more or less complete strands,[2] the majority of critics have looked upon this chapter as one of the clearest examples of how a redactor selected bits and pieces from J and E (see App. D). Although both divine names, YHWH and Elohim, are found (see especially vss. 27-28), the basis for the regnant hypothesis is the presence of a number of so-called doublets, suggesting more than one writer. The usual presentation of the evidence may be summarized as follows:

(i) two methods are used to disguise Jacob--goat skins (vss. 11, 16, 22), and Esau's clothes (vss. 15, 27);

(ii) two tests of Jacob's identity are made--by feeling (vss. 22-23), and by smelling (vs. 27);

(iii) there is double mention of the food which Isaac desired--game (ציד, vss. 3, 5, 7, 19, 25, 31, 33) and "savoury food" (מטעמים, vss. 4, 7, 9, 14, 17);

(iv) the savoury food is coupled with the goat skins, while Esau's clothes are connected with the hunting of game;

(v) finally, since YHWH is mentioned in vs. 27 in connection with game, the combination of clothing and game noted above is assigned to J, while the goat skins-savoury food motif is assigned to E. Further duplications are also noted: (a) Isaac is not aware of who tricked him (vs. 33), yet according to vs. 35 he knew that it was Jacob; (b) the expression "and he blessed him" is found in vss. 23 and 27, indicating that there must have been two accounts of the blessing. Gunkel felt that the analysis was verified by the fact that this episode is basic to later stories in both J and E (e.g., 32:4-22; 33: 1-16; 35:3, 7).[3]

The validity of the usual critical approach will be tested as the various episodes in the story are examined.

Vss. 1-4. Isaac's plan to bless Esau.

The repetition of ויאמר in vs. 2, following its use in vs. 1b, has led many critics to question the unity of vs. 1. The expression הנני (vs. 1) is regarded by many as a sign of E (cf. 22:1, 7, 11, etc.),[4] therefore the words ויאמר אליו בני ויאמר אליו הנני are assigned to E (see App. D). Such reasoning is not convincing. Unless one were searching for an E strand, he would not question the unity of the verse. Verses 2-3 are commonly assigned to J, as is vs. 4b. The mention of savoury food in vs. 4a, however, is taken as a sign of E. If vs. 4 is pulled apart in such a manner, a truncated story results. If vs. 4a followed that part of vs. 1 assigned to E, there would be no mention of hunting at all. Esau would be depicted as a mere cook sent out to the kitchen to prepare a favourite dish of his father's. On the other hand, the J story would mention that Esau was commanded to hunt for game, but would contain no instructions as to what he was to do with the game which he had obtained.[5] Surely the point is that the "game" which is caught is to be prepared in a tasty fashion loved by Isaac. The story becomes meaningless if it is torn apart.

Simpson's contention that the words תליך וקשתך in vs. 3 constitute a gloss is pure conjecture. There is no reason why a closer definition of a general term should be regarded as a later gloss.

It may be confidently asserted that vss. 1-4 constitute a unity.

Vss. 5-17. Rebekah's intervention.

The discussion of the first few verses of this segment by most scholars provides a good example of the way evidence can be manipulated in the interest of a theory. As vs. 7 stands, it records the words of Isaac as Rebekah related them to Jacob, and it mentions both the hunting of game and the preparation of the savoury food. If either of the latter were deleted, the same problem of fragmenting a story, as noted above, would obtain. Critics insist that the savoury food motif is from E, hence the last part of vs. 7 (beginning with ועשה־לי) is assigned to E. They are then forced to explain the expression לפני יהוה in an E verse! To make the evidence fit their theories, this phrase is regarded either as a small extract from the J story, or a later insertion (see App. D).

Verses 8-14 are generally regarded by critics as a unity from E, although few clear signs of E authorship are to be found. The next alleged inconsistency is found in vs. 15. Here Esau's clothes are mentioned, while in vs. 16 Rebekah's attempt to disguise her son with goat skins is related. Once more the desire to find parallel strands appears to have been the determining factor in the study of these verses. However, Cassuto has advanced two good reasons for maintaining the unity of vs. 15-16: (i) Since Esau was known both for the hairiness of his body and for the smell of the outdoors which clung to his clothes, Rebekah, if she were to do a good job, would surely not neglect to take preventive measures against these means of identification for a blind man. (ii) The construction found in vss. 15 and 16 (ותלבש את־יעקב ... ואת ערת גדיי העזים הלבישה ....) conforms to a well-known pattern of Hebrew style. "When a verb occurs twice in parallel succession, the Bible is accustomed to change its tense and position: once it appears in the imperfect converted to the past, and subsequently in the perfect; the first time it comes at the beginning of the sentence, and the second time after some other word . . . for example . . . Gen. 1:5; 4:2, 5, 11:3 . . . hence they cannot be separated."[7]

Gunkel suggested that ואת־הלחם (vs. 17) is a later gloss since bread has not been mentioned previously (see App. D). Surely Rebekah, for her son's sake, is free to attempt to please Isaac by doing more than he asked. An additional item of food need not be a secondary addition. What would prompt a later scribe to make such an addition? Thus, in these verses, as in the case of vss. 1-4, there is absolutely no evidence pointing to more than one hand.

Vss. 18-29. The blessing of Jacob.

Verses 18-22 are divided up in a variety of ways by different critics (see App. D). Verses 19-20, because of the mention of game and the use of the name YHWH, are assigned to J, but the use of הנני in vs. 18 marks it off as E. Once more it is obvious that such a subdivision spoils the story, since the J account would lack a notice to the effect that Jacob went in to his father, while if vs. 18b^{a} were removed from its context, Jacob's reply to his son's question would be missing.

The most crucial problem in the entire chapter is found in vss. 23 and 27. In the former verse the skins on Jacob's hands and neck fool his father and he is blessed, while in vs. 27 the clothing of Esau deceives Isaac, and it is once more stated that "he blessed him". It is the double occurrence of ויברכהו which is at the heart of the problem, not the different attempts to deceive, which, as noted above, are not signs of multiple authorship. Several attempts to explain this repetition without resorting to documentary analysis have been made. Eerdmans suggested that since Esau had not yet eaten in vs. 23 (cf. vs. 25) and since the food was a prior requirement to a blessing (cf. vs. 4), vs. 23 cannot refer to the actual blessing. He translated the term in question, "Er hiess ihn willkommen."[8] Volz, noting that the reference in vs. 23 was such a glaring error that a redactor would surely have made a smoother transition, suggested that ויברכהו is "einfach Glosse, Randnote".[9] It is clear, however, that the narrative cannot have ended with vs. 23 since Isaac has not yet eaten of the dish concerning which so much is said in the first part of the chapter.

The solution of the problem would seem to lie in determining the purpose of vss. 26-27. It is generally assumed that a second attempt is made by Isaac to determine the identity of his son, but this is not even alluded to; the smell of Esau's clothes likely reached Isaac without Esau having approached. What actually happens is that the men embrace, with the result that the smell of Esau's clothes reached the blind father's nostrils. The author, in composing Isaac's blessing, takes up this reference to smelling and uses it for the opening line: "See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a field which the LORD has blessed!" (vs. 27). Verses 26-27 are, therefore, not a reference to a secondary test, but are intended to provide a transition to the key word at the beginning of the blessing.

This does not do away with the repetition of ויברכהו but it throws the episode into a slightly different light. Cassuto's suggestion that the reference in vs. 23 is intended to relieve the tension which has been mounting to a climax appears rather gratuitous. On the other hand, his second idea that the former reference is a generalized statement, while in vs. 27 the blessing itself is spelled out, would seem to offer the best solution to date to the problem.[10] On occasion, a Hebrew writer summarized the episode as a whole, and then related the details (see 11:5-7; 32:23-24; 37:21).

Verses 27b-29 are usually distributed between J and E for the following reasons: (i) the two divine names, YHWH (vs. 27) and Elohim (vs. 28); (ii) verse 29b is reminiscent of 12:3 (J); (iii) "peoples" (vs. 29a^{a}) is a parallel to "brothers" (vs. 29a^{b}).[11]

Contrary to the usual view, any attempt to split the Blessing of Isaac into two strands must be viewed with suspicion. The occurrence of יהוה and האלהים (note the use of the article) provides no basis for such a division, for האלהים clearly refers back to יהוה in vs. 27. Nor can a basis be found in the presence of parallel clauses in vs. 29. In a word, there are no adequate grounds for suspecting the unity of the Blessing. Furthermore, vs. 27a ties it closely to the preceding narrative, making it certain that it is by the same hand (J).

One is struck by the purely nationalistic character of the blessing. As von Rad has observed, it is "merkwürdigerweise unabhängig von den sonst ziemlich gleichmässig formulierten Erzväterverheissungen (Kap. 12, 1-3; 13, 14-16; 22, 17; 26, 24; 28, 3 f., 13-15 usw.)."[12] It contains no promise of the land. Possession of the land is taken for granted; there is merely a wish that it may be fruitful. There is no promise of an heir or of numerous descendants, but the wish is expressed that Jacob will dominate his brothers (i.e., the other Hebrew tribes) and rule over other peoples. Only at the end of the blessing is there a couplet which resembles the promise to Abraham in 12:2-3; thus ארריך ארור ומברכיך ברוך (27:29) parallels ואברכה מברכיך ומקללך אאר (12:3). Taken as a whole, however, the Blessing of Isaac in ch. 27 has nothing of the deeply religious character of the promise to Abraham in 12:2-3.

Vss. 30-40. Esau seeks a blessing.

The story of how Esau discovered that he had been tricked is assigned to J and E by most critics, although their conclusions vary considerably (see App. D). Their chief reasons for questioning the unity of this section are: (i) verse 30a[a] is said to be a doublet to vs. 30a[b]; (ii) according to vs. 33 Isaac is unaware of who had tricked him, while in vs. 35 he states that it was Esau's brother; (iii) the repetition of ברכני גם־אני אבי (vss. 34 and 38); (iv) verses 34 and 38 are doublets in that they both mention Esau's anguish and disappointment.

It is evident that critics committed to a theory of parallel strands have attempted once more to discover two more or less complete accounts in this section. The result of their analysis is to destroy completely the dramatic force of the account. That Esau should plead for a blessing on more than one occasion, and also express his rage at what Jacob had done, is natural under the circumstances and is part of the climactic development of the story. The argument concerning the identity of Jacob in vss. 33 and 35 is not impressive. Verse 33 records Isaac's emotional upset at the discovery that he had been tricked, while by vs. 35 it has dawned on him what had really happened. It is also unnecessary to consider vs. 30a as being made up of doublets. The author obviously wished to point out that Esau's arrival followed immediately upon two things, the completion of Isaac's act of blessing, and Jacob's departure. Neither of these can be omitted without weakening the story.

Attention should also be drawn to the relationship between the blessing bestowed upon Jacob and that granted to Esau. The wording in both shows that the same hand is responsible for them, and the contrast which is achieved shows that a conscious attempt was made to illustrate the difference between the two. This contrast is brought out clearly by the different syntactic use of the preposition *min*, which is partitive in vs. 28, but privative in vs. 39. Furthermore, there is no justification for removing the blessing on Esau from the rest of the story. Some response is surely required from Isaac. Esau's request for a blessing could not be left in mid-air.

Vss. 41-45. Rebekah's plan for Jacob's safety.

The unity of this section has been suspected for the following reasons: (i) the double mention of Esau in vs. 41; (ii) in vs. 41 Esau plots revenge "in his heart," hence it is unlikely that vs. 42 which states that his *words* were told to Rebekah is from the same hand; (iii) verses 44b and 45a are said to be doublets.

As far as argument (i) is concerned, the same phenomenon appears in 21:1 where the sentence appears to form a literary unit (see above, pp. 74-75). The second has more force but the expression "said in his heart" may mean simply that Esau "contemplated" revenge, without necessarily implying that he kept silent about his intentions. Verses 44b and 45a seem to be an example of climactic parallelism in prose: "and stay with him a while, *until* your brother's fury turns away.
until your brother's anger turns away from you
and he forgets what you did to him."

Critics assign most of vss. 42-45 to E (see App. D), but are forced to delete חרנה in vs. 43 because they regard it as a J word. Since there are no valid grounds for assigning vss. 42-45 to E, חרנה may also be retained (see also on 29:4).

Vs. 46. Rebekah's complaint.

The reference to "the daughters of the land" and "the daughters of חת" points to P as the author of this verse (see App. D). Note his reference in ch. 23 to the indigenous inhabitants of the Hebron area as "the people of the land" (vss. 7, 12, 13) and as "the sons of חת" (vss. 3, 5, 10, 16, 18, 20). Verse 46 refers back to 26:34, where P states that Esau took Hittite wives.

The object of P's addition seems to be to soften the implication of the J narrative that Jacob fled from home, doubtless to the distress of his aged father. He has Rebekah suggest to her husband Isaac how distressed she would be if their son Jacob were to marry a Hittite wife, as Esau had already done. Isaac agrees and sends Jacob to Paddan Aram to get a wife from among their relatives. Thus by this device P preserves the peaceful atmosphere of the patriarchal home.

Summary.

The above study of ch. 27 reveals that the arguments which have been advanced against the literary unity lack cogency, except those for assigning vs. 46 to P. It is necessary now to consider the relationship of the chapter to the J narrative seen in 25:21, 24-26a, 27-34. Eissfeldt maintains that in 25:34 Esau is represented as departing from Jacob's presence for good, therefore no further contact between the brothers is to be expected. This suggests to Eissfeldt that ch. 27 is from a different source than 25:34. Since he assigns ch. 25 to L, ch. 27 must be assigned to his secondary strand, which he calls J.[14] Simpson agrees with this view, calling ch. 27 "J2".[15] Such a view is questionable. All that 25:34 really says is that after eating and drinking, Esau left. There is no indication that he left for good, nor is any mention made of where he went. Had he departed for a different part of the land or for a distant country, surely this would have been noted.

Chapter 26 (the Story of Isaac) is an intrusive element in the Jacob Story, as pointed out above (pp. 153-154), breaking the connection between 25:21, 24-26a, 27-34 and 27:1-45. There is no reason for doubting that the severed parts of the Jacob Story are the work of the same hand. Genesis 27:36 makes it clear that 25:27-34 was known to the author of ch. 27. This means that ch. 27 could be by the same, or a later, writer. It is more natural to see in the two stories the two halves of an artistic whole: in 25:21, etc., Esau sells his בכרה; in ch. 27, he loses his ברכה as well. Thus both parts may be attributed to the same J author.

NOTES ON CHAPTER III

[1] *Die Composition*, pp. 32-33.

[2] E.g. Skinner, *Genesis*, pp. 368-369; Noth, *ÜP*, p. 30.

[3] *Genesis*, p. 305.

[4] Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 369.

[5] Cf. Cassuto, *Documentary Hypothesis*, p. 89.

[6] Cf. Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 370.

[7] *Documentary Hypothesis*, pp. 91-92.

[8] *Die Komposition der Genesis*, p. 47.

[9] *Der Elohist*, p. 66.

[10] *Documentary Hypothesis*, p. 96.

[11] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 312.

[12] *Genesis*, *ATD*, p. 242.

[13] Simpson, *ETI*, p. 97.

[14] *EUCHARISTERION*, I, p. 65.

[15] *ETI*, p. 94.

IV GENESIS 28

Jacob's departure for Haran and his experiences at Bethel are related in a narrative which falls into four major sections. These will be examined in turn below.

Vss. 1-9. Plans to obtain a wife for Jacob. Esau takes a third wife.

Critics have universally assigned these verses to P because of the occurrence of the following characteristic P expressions: אל שדי (vs. 3); אלהים (vs. 4); פדן ארם (vss. 2, 5, 6, 7); ארץ מגריך (vs. 4); בנות כנען (vss. 1, 6, 8).[1] It is obvious that these verses are closely connected with 27:46 (P) and come from a different hand than 27:1-45 where Jacob's departure for Haran is due not to a command by Isaac but to fear of his brother. It is clear that the P insertion at this point was made for two reasons: (a) to have Jacob depart with his father's consent; (b) to emphasize that Jacob was the recipient of the complete blessing which had been bestowed upon Abraham and Isaac, but which, as noted above, was not bestowed upon Jacob in full in ch. 27.

Von Rad points to these verses as another example of parallel strands in P. He assigns vss. 1, 2, 6, 7 to PA, and vss. 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 to PB. The main reasons for this view are: (i) verses 6-7 are impossible after vs. 5 in that they do not advance the story; (ii) there are two accounts of how Isaac's command was carried out: vs. 5 (וילך), and vs. 7 (וישמע ... וילך); (iii) the blessing in vs. 3 is out of keeping with vs. 1 which also states that Isaac blessed him.[2] Max Löhr has also suggested that most of vss. 3-7 is secondary in nature.[3] These theories do not take P's literary style sufficiently into consideration. Logically vss. 6 and 7 form the protasis and vs. 8 the apodosis of one sentence.[4] As Paul Humbert has shown, the entire pericope is a consistent whole.[5]

Vss. 10-12. Jacob's dream at Bethel.

Because of the use of the divine name Elohim (vs. 12) and the mention of a dream (vs. 12) most critics assign the bulk of these verses to E (see App. D). The mention of חרנה (vs. 10) gives them trouble since it is supposed to be a J word (cf. above on 27:43).[6]

It is obvious that 28:10 ff. continues the story last met in 27:45. Since, as has been shown above, ch. 27 is entirely from the hand of J, there is no good reason to question the J authorship of these verses. Simply because a dream is mentioned here, as in 20:3 (E), does not necessarily mean that the present reference must be by E. The only other so-called mark of E is the use of the name Elohim (vs. 12). But the appellative use of Elohim such as is found here, where מלאכי אלהים obviously means "divine angels", cannot be used as evidence for E as some critics have conceded.[7] Thus there is no internal evidence against attributing vss. 10-12 to J.

Vss. 13-15. YHWH's promise to Jacob.

A number of reasons have been advanced by critics for considering these verses an intrusion into the basic E story:

(i) the divine name YHWH is used (vss. 13, 16);

(ii) YHWH appears in person, not in the form of an angel (vs. 13, cf. vs. 12);

(iii) verses 13 and 15 anticipate vss. 20-22.

The occurrence of the divine name YHWH is clear evidence that the section is not by E. The problem, therefore, resolves itself into determining whether it is from J or from C since both employ the name YHWH. In favor of C authorship the following points may be noted:

(i) כעפר הארץ (vs. 14, cf. 13:16, C);

(ii) the four directions (vs. 14, cf. 13:14, C);

(iii) the use of ברך in the Niph'al (vs. 14, cf. 12:3; 18:18, both C, the only other examples in the Old Testament);

(iv) כל־משפחת האדמה (vs. 14, cf. 12:3, C).

It is obvious that these verses constitute another of C's promises to the patriarchs.

The customary assignment of vss. 10-12 to E and of vss. 13-15 to

J makes it necessary for critics to assume that the editor departed from his usual practice in this chapter, in that the E story rather than that of J must have been used as the basis of his account. While this is a possible view, by assigning vss. 10-12 to J and vss. 13-15 to C such a hypothesis is made unnecessary.

Vss. 16-22. Jacob sanctifies Bethel.

Whether vs. 16 is part of the basic J account or belongs to C's addition is somewhat uncertain. Since some reference to Jacob awakening seems required in the basic story, it seems best to regard it as the work of J. Critics have been in general agreement that vss. 17-22 are basically a unity from E, with the possible exception of vss. 19b and 21b (see App. D). The occurrence of the divine name YHWH (vs. 21) in an E account is explained as due to later interpolation. Simpson assigns vs. 19b to J2, thus, he feels, strengthening his assignment of 12:8 to J1.[8]

If vss. 16-22 are from the same hand as vss. 10-12, i.e., J, the use of YHWH in vs. 21 is no problem. Some explanation, however, must be given for the use of אלהים in vss. 17, 20, 21, 22. The expression בית אלהים in vss. 17 and 22 is in the same category as the "divine angels" of vs. 12, since it means "sanctuary, holy place". The occurrences in vss. 20-21 appear to be more of a problem, but two observations are in order: (a) YHWH and Elohim are identified (vs. 21), i.e., Jacob states that if the being who has startled him in his dream will do for him the things enumerated, he will believe him to be divine, and the shrine will be provided for; (b) the purpose of the whole story is to show how Bethel received its name and how it was discovered to be holy (vss. 19, 22).[9] For this, Elohim rather than YHWH was naturally required.

The results of the above examination of the literary structure of ch. 28 may be summarized as follows:

J--vss. 10-12, 16-22;
C--vss. 13-15;
P--vss. 1-9.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IV

[1] Skinner, Genesis, p. 375.

[2] Die Priesterschrift, pp. 28-31.

[3] Der Priesterkodex, p. 15.

[4] Cf. GK, sec. 167c.

[5] "Die literarische Zweiheit," pp. 52-53.

[6] Cf. ETI, p. 97.

[7] Der Elohist, pp. 75-76.

[8] ETI, p. 97.

[9] Cf. Volz, Der Elohist, p. 78.

V GENESIS 29

In this and the following four chapters the story revolves almost entirely around the attempts of Jacob and Laban to out-smart one another. Because of the interdependent character of these chapters, the analysis of any one of them must remain tentative until the group as a whole has been examined.

Vss. 1-14. Jacob meets Rachel.

Since the expression "land of the Bene Kedem" is used (vs. 1), and since J narrated a similar tale in ch. 24, Wellhausen suggested that vss. 1-14 should be assigned to E.[1] Dillmann felt that vss. 15 ff. were from E, but since they did not fit well with the preceding section, vss. 2-14 should be attributed to J, with vs. 1 serving as E's introduction.[2] This view was followed in the main by Gunkel and Procksch (see App. D) and by Smend who argued that vs. 1 could also be assigned to J.[3] Eissfeldt and Simpson distribute various parts of these verses among their three early sources (see App. D).

It is difficult to justify the assignment of vs. 1 to a source different from that which forms the basis of the following story, since vs. 2 requires an introduction. Verse 1, following 28:22, gets Jacob into the general area of his destination, while vss. 2 ff. relate the story of what happened at a specific spot within that area. The expression "land of the Bene Kedem" is not found elsewhere as a designation of the Haran area (cf. vs. 4). In 25:6 C uses "land of Kedem" for the vast area east of Canaan. The author of ch. 29 appears to use the term with a more restricted connotation.

Critics generally point to the three-fold introduction of Rachel (vss. 6, 9 and 16) as evidence of multiple authorship. As far as vss. 6 and 9 are concerned, vs. 6 points to her coming, vs. 9 to her arrival. The attention of the reader (or listener) is diverted in the meantime to the conversation between Jacob and the shepherds in order to give her time to reach the well. Thus there is no basis for the contention that she is introduced twice. The statement in vs. 9 that she was a shepherdess may not have been logically necessary since that fact is implied in the reference to her in vs. 6. However, the author may have wished to stress the pastoral, nomadic ancestry of the Hebrews.

Verse 7, which depicts Jacob ordering the shepherds around, may be a subtle touch on the part of the writer who wished to suggest thereby Jacob's superior social status.

In vs. 10 the double mention of Jacob and the three-fold reference to Laban as "his mother's brother" have been regarded as especially good evidence of composite authorship. The stress on Laban's relationship to Jacob's mother can, however, be explained quite naturally as a reminder that Jacob's journey was carried out in accordance with his mother's plan (see 27:43-45). It may also be intended to suggest that Laban will play an important role in what follows.

It has been generally felt that the order of vss. 11 and 12 should be inverted since according to the present sequence Jacob kissed Rachel before telling her who he was.[4] But it must be remembered that the order in which events are narrated by an ancient writer is not necessarily to be taken as the order in which they occurred. The series of consecutive statements form a whole in which the author puts the most dramatic or emotion-filled action first and then adds the conversation which accompanied, or even preceded, it. A similar phenomenon was encountered in ch. 24 where Abraham's servant is depicted as bedecking Rebekah with jewellery (vs. 22) and then asking who she is (vs. 23). In the present case, the sentence-order may also have been influenced by the desire of the author to have וַיִּשַּׁק (vs. 11) follow וַיַּשְׁקְ as soon as possible. Such word-plays were no doubt popular.

A study of vss. 1-14 thus shows that there are no adequate grounds for suspecting the presence of more than one source. To cut up the story on the basis of the references to Rachel and assign bits and pieces to E, J and L respectively, as Eissfeldt does,[5] results in a series of fragments, none of which makes much sense unless it is assumed that major portions of the original sources must have been deleted in the editorial process.[6] The story is perfectly consistent with the accounts in 27:42-45 and 28:10-12, 16-22, and may, therefore, be assigned to J.

Wellhausen noted the similarity of the story of Jacob's meeting with Rachel at a well outside Haran to the story in ch. 24 of Abraham's servant meeting Rebekah at a well outside the city where Nahor, Abraham's brother, lived in Aram-naharaim, making it probable that one account was based on the other.[7] The study of ch. 29 thus far suggests that it is the work of J, whereas ch. 24 was assigned to C. Hence if one story is based on the other, may it not be the story in ch. 24 which is modelled on the Jacob-Rachel narrative in ch. 29, not vice-versa?

Vss. 15-30. Jacob's marriage to Leah and Rachel.

Most critics assign the bulk of this section to E, with several verses attributed to P. Eissfeldt, however, feels that the material is basically L (see App. D). The principal argument for assigning this section to a different source from the preceding verses is that in vs. 16 Rachel seems to be introduced for the first time.[8] This argument is far from convincing. Verse 16 merely points out that Laban had two daughters and proceeds to contrast them. Rachel is not introduced as a new character but placed in relationship with her older sister who has not been mentioned previously. Simpson feels that vs. 15 cannot have been the original continuation of vs. 14 since it requires some mention of Jacob working for Laban.[9] But vs. 14 states that he stayed with Laban for a whole month, and vs. 15 implies that during that time he had not been idle. Now Laban feels that he must offer Jacob some remuneration for his services.[10]

Having divorced this story from the preceding J account in vss. 2-14, Gunkel and Simpson find J material only in vs. 26 (see App. D). The reason for this assignment is the use of the terms הצעירה, הבכירה to designate the daughters, since E used הגדלה , הקטנה previously (vs. 16). It is possible that the author selected two sets of terms merely for variety, since it is impossible to delete either reference without spoiling the story. To delete vs. 26 means that vs. 27 is left without a notice to the effect that Laban is speaking to Jacob, and means that further editorial tampering has to be suggested.

Procksch tried to find bits of a J strand in parts of vss. 23, 25, 27, 28 and 30.[11] Attempting to follow the reconstructed text of the story which Procksch offers proves to be almost impossible, and serves only to emphasize the weaknesses of his view.

It is generally agreed that vss. 24, 28b-29 should be assigned to P. That these fragments are "easily recognized" as being from P[12] is debatable. The only evidence adduced is the mention of the maids and the stylistic similarity to 16:3, P.[13] It is true that vs. 28 is very similar to 16:3, but it is difficult to see how else the idea could have been expressed by the author; cf. 12:19 (J); 20:13 (E); 24:67 (C). Whether or not the maids mentioned in vss. 24 and 29 can be removed from the story without spoiling it will depend largely on the results of the analysis of ch. 30. If the maidservants play a significant role later, it is possible that the story-teller would prepare for their later inclusion by introducing them here. Furthermore, to cut out the mention of Laban giving Rachel to Jacob as a wife (vs. 28) would leave a lacuna before vs. 30.

It is suggested provisionally, therefore, that vss. 15-30 are a unity and that they follow logically after vss. 1-14. There is no good reason why vss. 15-30 cannot be assigned to J. Attention may be drawn to the occurrence in vs. 20 of the unusual expression ימים אחדים which was employed by J in 27:44. The expression יפת מראה (vs. 17) was used also by J in 12:11, while C used טבת מראה in 24:16 and 26:7.

Vss. 31-35. Leah bears four sons.

These verses are universally assigned to J by critics (see App. D); even Eissfeldt does not assign the section to L but to J. The use of the divine name YHWH in vss. 31, 32, 33, 35 clearly supports this view. Gunkel's claim that in vs. 32 the expression יאהבני represents a second etymology for the name Reuben and hence is to be assigned to E[14] appears rather tenuous, since a fragmentary notice from E without additional information is highly unlikely. The unity of vss. 31-35 will be discussed below in connection with subsequent stories relating the birth of more children to Jacob.

The above analysis of ch. 29 has demonstrated that the evidence which has been adduced by critics to support the presence of an E strand is capable of being interpreted in a way which is consonant with a theory of single authorship.[15] There is still room for doubt concerning the inclusion of the maids in vss. 24 and 29 but this matter will receive fuller attention below in the discussion of the first part of ch. 30.

NOTES ON CHAPTER V

[1] *Die Composition*, p. 35.

[2] *Die Genesis*, p. 338.

[3] *Die Erzählung*, pp. 71-72.

[4] See Simpson, *ETI*, pp. 97-98.

[5] *HS*, pp. 21-22.

[6] Cf. Volz, *Der Elohist*, p. 79.

[7] *Die Composition*, p. 35.

[8] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 327.

[9] *ETI*, p. 99.

[10] The suggestion by D. Daube and R. Yaron, "Jacob's Reception by Laban," *JSS*, I (1956), pp. 60-62, that vss. 14-15 do not constitute an offer of payment but a repudiation of any recognition of Jacob's standing in the family, hence making Jacob a hireling, merits consideration. Such a view does not affect the literary analysis, other than making it even more plausible for vss. 14-15 to be assigned to the same hand.

[11] *Die Genesis*, p. 176.

[12] Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 381.

[13] Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, p. 35.

[14] *Genesis*, p. 333.

[15] Cf. Noth, *ÜP*, p. 30.

VI GENESIS 30

The analysis of chs. 30 and 31 proposed by previous critics is the most complex suggested for any part of Genesis (see App. D). Chapter 30 may be divided into two major parts, the first dealing with the birth of further children to Jacob (vss. 1-24), the second having to do with Jacob's acquisition of wealth (vss. 25-43).

Vss. 1-24. Additional children of Jacob.

It is obvious that these verses continue the story met in 29:31-35, which relate that Leah bore four sons to Jacob. It was noted that critics agree in assigning the material in ch. 29 to J (see above, p. 172). The account of the other children born to Leah and to Rachel and their two maids is attributed to various writers, Simpson finding as many as seven hands. Although critics do not agree on the details of their analysis they share the common view that their efforts are firmly grounded in the occurrence of a number of doublets in the story. These so-called doublets and variations in terminology are the chief supports on which previous critics have built their theories; hence they must be examined first.

(i) The expressions אמה and שפחה have been used by some critics as a sure criterion for source analysis, the former being regarded as a mark of E, while the latter is said to be used by J and P.[1] This supposed distinction between E and other writers has been maintained at considerable cost. For example, as was noted in connection with 20:14, a verse which is clearly part of E material, the occurrence of שפחה has been explained by several critics as a gloss. The same thing is done in ch. 30. Simpson, for example, assigns שפחתי in 30:18 to R^{JE},[2] and Gunkel removed שפחה in vs. 7, since it occurs in the midst of E material.[3] It is instructive that אמה is found only once (vs. 3), while שפחה is used repeatedly (vss. 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 18). Volz drew attention to the fact that אמה (vs. 3) is used in direct speech, while the references to שפחה are found in narrative portions.[4] This attempted solution of the use of the two terms is no better, since Volz is forced to call vs. 18 a gloss, because there Leah uses שפחה in direct speech.[5] Furthermore, 31:33 gives an example of אמה in narrative. It may be that more attention should be paid to the difference in meaning between these two terms, as Jepsen has suggested,[6] but it is clear that the assignment of verses and parts of verses to parallel strands on the basis of such evidence, and the removal of any remaining difficulties in a subjective manner is not a sound procedure.

(ii) The alleged presence of double etymologies in the account of the birth of several sons has also been taken as evidence for multiple authorship. Gunkel noted the following: (a) Asher--the words כי אשרוני בנות (vs. 13) should be assigned to E, since they offer a second etymology for the name; (b) Issachar-- שכרתיך (vs. 16) is said to be E's parallel to שכרי (vs. 18) which is the work of J; (c) Zebulun-- זבדני (vs. 20) is by E, while the J variant is based on יזבלני (vs. 20); (d) Joseph--E's explanation is based on אסף (vs. 23), while the hand of J can be seen in the expression יסף יהוה (vs. 24).[7]

It is extremely doubtful, however, that a double etymology is suggested for the name Asher. The name is based entirely on the statement of Leah that she is happy and that her friends will call her happy (vs. 13). Zebulun may also be removed from Gunkel's list. The employment of the verb זבד, which resembles זבל in sound, can quite naturally be explained as another example of the love of paronomasia prevalent among the Semites. It is most unlikely that the author was suggesting a derivation of זבלון from the root זבד. Another name with two suggested etymologies is Issachar. The reason for there being two etymologies in this case is that an additional tale, namely that dealing with the mandrake episode (vss. 14-16), is worked into the account by the writer. It may well be that this story had a separate history at one time, but it was incorporated into the over-all story of the birth of Jacob's children. It is quite unnecessary to assign the mandrake story to J, and the verses before and after to E, as most critics do (see App. D). The incident merely adds further information, and may be assigned to the writer of the story as a whole. The name Joseph is provided with two explanations: Rachel's use of אסף (vs. 23) and the expression יסף יהוה (vs. 24). However, as was shown in the study of ch. 25, the presence of more than one explanation does not necessarily imply more than one writer (see p. 146). It is also clear that the so-called double explanation of the name Reuben in 29:32 does not favor a theory of parallel accounts, as was noted above (see p. 172).

(iii) The occurrence of the two divine names in the story of the birth of Jacob's children (29:31-30:24) has been regarded by critics as providing one of the clearest evidences that the story has been compiled from two sources, J and E. YHWH is used in 29:31-35, and Elohim in 30:1-23. In 30:24 YHWH is once more employed. Critics have therefore assigned 29:31-35 and 30:24 to J, with the bulk of the remainder going to E (see App. D). Having decided that two strands are present, they have then sought doublets at every turn in the hope of isolating two more or less complete accounts. To take but two examples, vs. 1 has been dismembered simply because Rachel is twice mentioned, and vs. 3b is pulled apart since so-called parallel statements are recorded.[8] Such a theory clearly misses the point that many of these so-called doublets actually augment one another.[9]

Acceptance of the two-source theory involves the assumption either that J's account of the births was superior to E's at the beginning and end but inferior in the middle, leading an editor to select only the beginning and end of the J account, or that J mentioned the birth of only the first four sons of Leah (29:31-35) and Joseph (30:24). It is most unlikely that J would mention the birth of only four of the six sons of Leah, since they form a natural group. With regard to the first alternative, it seems rather odd that J's literary talents should prove inferior to E's precisely at the point where he began to deal with the sons of the concubines. One possibility is that a writer using the divine name Elohim added the accounts of the birth of sons by concubines, but this would fail to explain the use of Elohim with the two later sons of Leah. There is no change in style or pattern in the section as a whole which can be used to support a theory of two writers.

On the other hand, it is impossible to get rid of the evidence for an E source by pointing out that Elohim is used as a mere appellative in vss. 2 and 8,[10] for it still remains as a proper name in the other verses listed. Volz suggested that some of the latter cases might be accounted for by the theory that the names are contractions of theophoric names, e.g., Dan (vs. 6) is a contraction of Dani'el.[11] But was the author aware of such a derivation? If he was, why did he employ YHWH in some etymologies?

One fact is clear: the divine name YHWH is employed in describing the birth of a group of Leah tribes culminating in Judah, and in describing the birth of Rachel's son, Joseph (the father of Manasseh and Ephraim). This suggests that the choice of divine name has something to do with tribal prestige. It is surely not a mere coincidence that the sacred name, YHWH, is used with the two tribes which were to play the dominant political role. If the writer wished to lead up to Judah, it is understandable that he would use the divine name YHWH with the first sons on the list to avoid changing divine names too often. Reuben and Simeon were in no position to challenge Judah for political leadership in any case. It is instructive that with the third son, Levi, no divine name is used. This may indicate that Levi, a priestly tribe, was above such political considerations. Since Issachar and Zebulun, the other sons of Leah, are normally listed after Judah (see Gen. 35:23; 46:8-13; 49:1-15; Exod. 1:3; I Ch. 3:1), the very fact that they are removed from their normal position in the present passage would suggest that this scheme is the result of a deliberate change in the order.

It is to be admitted that the evidence does not point to a clear-cut solution, and the above comments regarding these verses are little more than tentative. The whole problem of the origin of the tribes themselves is closely related to the literary development of the accounts, but this involves considerations beyond the limits of the present study.[12]

Many critics have suggested that vss. 4a, 9b which refer to the giving of the maid-servants to Jacob as wives are from P because of their similarity to 16:3 (P). But, as pointed out above in discussing 29:24, 28b-29, the expression "to give someone to somebody for a wife" is not characteristic of any one period or of any one writer. Furthermore the maids and their children seem to be an integral part of the birth story; their omission reduces the story to chaos. It is evident, then, that 29:24, 28b-29, whose documentary affinities were left undetermined when they were discussed above, must also be regarded as a part of the basic narrative.

It may be noted that Dinah, a daughter of Leah, is introduced in vs. 21. It will be possible only after a study of ch. 34 in which Dinah plays a major role to determine whether or not the mention of her at this time is an original part of the story or an anticipation of the later narrative.

Thus, with the origin of vs. 21 being left undetermined for the time being, it appears as if the rest of the section, vss. 1-24, may be assigned to one writer. Since this account continues 29:31-35, it too may be assigned to J.

Vss. 25-43. Jacob's acquisition of wealth.

Critics have thought to detect a number of doublets and inconsistencies in these verses and have attempted to explain their presence by assigning some parts to J and others to E (see App. D). Skinner, however, is forced to suggest another E stratum, since the verses assigned to E do not agree with 31:7-12 which he feels are also E.[13] Also aware of the inconsistency which would result if this material were attributed to E, Martin Noth feels that the answer is to be found in calling vss. 25-43 basically J with "allerlei spätere Zusätze."[14] Volz has noted the dramatic development of the story and has stressed its unity.[15]

In the preliminary discussions between Laban and Jacob critics have attempted to detect the following doublets:

(i) Verses 25 and 26. They do not, however, record two similar requests by Jacob to be permitted to leave for home, as suggested by Gunkel.[16] It is only in vs. 25 that Jacob asks permission to leave; vs. 26 is a request for payment due to him.

(ii) Verses 27 and 28. These can scarcely be termed doublets simply because ויאמר occurs twice.[17] Laban is speaking of two different matters, and ויאמר in vs. 28 serves to mark the logical distinction, as in 24:24, 25. According to vs. 27 he politely acknowledges that Jacob's stay has been a blessing to him, while in vs. 28 he invites Jacob to name his wages.

(iii) Verses 28 and 31a.[18] While it is true that Laban twice asks Jacob to name his wages, this has been forced upon him by Jacob who refused to give a direct answer to his question but like a good bargainer pointed out how much his stay had benefited Laban.[19]

(iv) Verses 26b and 29a are similar in form but, as Gunkel noted, differ in purpose and hence are not real doublets, although Gunkel still insisted on calling them such.[20] They provide another example of a typical bargaining session between two people who are trying to be polite without compromising. These opening verses (25-29) may, therefore, be regarded as a unity.

In the discussion of the reward itself critics find not only two strands but numerous later interpolations as well.[21] It is clear that Jacob actually asked for no other reward than off-color animals in Laban's flocks and herds. This must have meant only a small number of animals since Laban immediately agreed (vss. 31-34). When in vss. 35-36 it is said that Laban removed all such animals from the immediate vicinity and sent them a safe distance away, critics immediately assert that a second writer is responsible for this idea.[22] There are, however, no grounds for attributing vss. 35-36 to a different source. The emphasis at this point is on Laban's cunning and downright dishonesty, the result of which is that Jacob is left with the prospect of no reward at all.

In the following section, vss. 37-43, critics have also detected two strands (see App. D), because it is felt that Jacob used more than one method to obtain his wealth. However, the fact that Jacob was able to gain his reward by means of a two-fold stratagem need not point to multiple authorship at all. Jacob had been promised two different kinds of animals by Laban, black lambs and multi-colored goats (vss. 32-34). Verses 37 ff. relate how Jacob added to his possessions by means of streaked poles (vss. 37-39) and by the use of black animals to influence the birth of black lambs (vs. 40). Finally, vss. 41-43 record in summary fashion how Jacob employed selective breeding to ensure that the animals falling to him would be healthy specimens. The result was that Jacob became a very wealthy man. Intrigue is met with intrigue. All attempts to pull apart the story must be judged unsuccessful. Several explanatory statements are to be found in these verses, e.g., כשקתות לשתות...(vs. 38), but there is no good reason why such comments can not have been added when the tale was reduced to writing. In any case, a theory of parallel strands does not explain comments of this sort.

As Gunkel has noted, a story such as this would be popular among shepherds, and it may be assumed that this episode had a long history of oral transmission before it was written down.[23]

At first glance it might seem that the two halves of chapter 30 (vss. 1-24 and 25-43) have little connection with each other except that they both seem to be by a J writer (note the occurrence of יהוה in vss. 27 and 30). There is, however, an inward link between the two sections. Having acquired a large family of children, as related in the first section, Jacob expresses some concern about being able to provide for them (vs. 30). Thus vss. 25-43 form a fitting conclusion to the story of Jacob's sojourn with Laban at Haran.

NOTES ON CHAPTER VI

[1] Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, pp. 36-37.

[2] *ETI*, p. 407.

[3] *Genesis*, p. 329.

[4] *Der Elohist*, p. 83.

[5] *Ibid*., p. 87.

[6] "Ama^h und Schiphcha^h," *VT*, VIII (1958), pp. 293-297.

[7] *Genesis*, pp. 329-336.

[8] E.g. Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 329.

[9] Volz, *Der Elohist*, p. 88.

[10] E.g. Volz, *Der Elohist*, p. 82.

[11] *Der Elohist*, p. 82.

[12] Cf. Carl Steuernagel, *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan* (Berlin: C. A. Schwetscke, 1901); Martin Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels*, *BWANT*, IV, 1 (1930), and *Die Welt des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed. rev.; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957), pp. 54 ff. More recently, S. Mowinckel, "'Rahelstämme' und 'Leastämme'," *BZAW*, LXXVII (1959), pp. 129-150; also articles by Karl Elliger in *IDB*, especially "Territories of Tribes," IV, pp. 701-710, with important bibliography.

[13] *Genesis*, p. 390.

[14] *ÜP*, p. 31.

[15] *Der Elohist*, pp. 88-92.

[16] *Genesis*, p. 336.

[17] *Ibid*., p. 336.

[18] *Ibid*., p. 336.

[19] Cf. Volz, *Der Elohist*, p. 89.

[20] *Genesis*, p. 336.

[21] Cf. Simpson, *ETI*, pp. 102-105.

[22] Cf. Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 390.

[23] *Genesis*, p. 338.

VII GENESIS 31

After acquiring great wealth, Jacob and his family surreptitiously leave Laban's home (vss. 1-16). Laban pursues and overtakes them (vss. 17-35). Following a verbal duel with his son-in-law, he enters into a covenant with him (vss. 36-54).

Vss. 1-16. The preparation for flight.

Critics are unanimous in splitting up these verses among various hands. Verses 1 and 3 are often assigned to J, while the bulk of the remainder is said to be from E. It is also customary to regard vss. 10 and 12 as later interpolations (see App. D).

The reason usually advanced for denying that vss. 1-3 form a unity is that vss. 1 and 2 are said to be doublets. According to vs. 1 the cause of Jacob's flight was his discovery that Laban's sons had turned against him; according to vs. 2 it was due to his realization that Laban's attitude towards him had changed. Since vs. 1 is said to be based on 30:35 (J), and vs. 3 is referred to later by J in 32:10 and, furthermore, employs the divine name YHWH, these verses are assigned to J.[1] Verse 2 is assigned to E because it is regarded as continued by vs. 5 which is regarded as of E authorship. It is difficult to accept this reasoning as convincing. It seems more natural to see vs. 2 as complementary to vs. 1; the implication is that Laban's changed attitude is due to the attitude of his sons. Both he and his sons are annoyed at the failure of their schemes to defraud Jacob.

Nor is it possible to accept the view of some critics that vs. 1 is not a unity.[2] Verse 1b does not offer a different explanation of Jacob's activity than is found in 1a; it merely adds the observation that in this way he became wealthy.[3] Verses 1-3 form a perfectly natural unit. Since they form the natural sequel to the J narrative in ch. 30 and since they have YHWH command Jacob to return to the land of his fathers, they can be assigned to J.

Verses 4-16 form an interlude during which Jacob discusses the situation with his wives. The story is regarded as a unity by most critics, although Simpson has noted apparent inconsistencies in the story, finding evidences of "marked disorder."[4] He points to the superfluous details in vss. 8 and 9 which repeat the story of how he became wealthy, as well as the reference to dreams which must have taken place several years earlier.[5] Such observations are apt to be misleading since vss. 4-16 are obviously not intended to serve as a historical record of events in chronological order. Rather, Jacob sums up the events of the past years and notes how God has prospered him in spite of Laban's opposition. Dillmann regarded vss. 10-12, or at least vss. 10 and 12, as intrusive.[6] It is true that the attitude to the source of Jacob's wealth is different from that of the J account (30:25 ff.). According to the latter, his wealth came to him as the reward of his own cunning; according to the former it resulted from the fact that God was with him. This is not an argument for regarding vss. 10-12 as of different authorship from the rest of vss. 4-16, for the same point of view permeates the whole section; see especially vs. 9. It is an argument for believing that the section is from a hand other than J. The section exhibits several features which suggest that it comes from a non-J source: (i) the expression ארץ מולדתך (vs. 13) should be compared with מארצך וממולדתך used by J in 12:1; (ii) the mistreatment of Laban's daughters by their father (vss. 14-16) appears as a new element in the story; (iii) the order in which the wives are mentioned, i.e., Rachel before Leah (vss. 4, 14), points to a different emphasis than in J; (iv) the idea that Laban changed Jacob's wages "ten times", while probably not to be taken literally, is still a different emphasis from that of the J story which reported that Jacob set the terms and Laban readily agreed (30:31 ff.).

The following evidences of E authorship have been adduced: (i) אלהים (vss. 5, 7, 9, 16, 16); מלאך האלהים (vs. 11), and האל (vs. 13); (ii) the dream (vss. 10-11; cf. 20:3-6); (iii) the reference to a maṣṣebah (vs. 13); (iv) the expression הנני at the end of vs. 11; cf. 22:1, 7, 11.[8]

This evidence is not to be accepted without reservation. Dreams and maṣṣebahs are not confined to E (cf. 28:12, 16 ff., a narrative which we have found reason for assigning to J), nor is the expression, הנני , at the end of vs. 11 found only in E sections (see ch. 27). The occurrence of Elohim in vss. 4-16 does, however, suggest that an E source is here encountered. It is not possible to explain away the use of Elohim by noting that the story has its setting outside YHWH's land since J shows no hesitation about using YHWH in such a setting (cf. 29:31 ff.), nor does C (cf. ch. 24). The matter is complicated by the fact that J, under certain circumstances, appears to have used Elohim (cf. chs. 29-30). It is difficult, however, in the present instance to conceive of any probable reason for a J writer to use Elohim. Thus it seems necessary to attribute the section (vss. 4-16) to E. This is the first evidence so far encountered that the J account of the Jacob Story has been supplemented by an E hand. The purpose of the E insertion is clearly to point out that Jacob's rise to wealth was not due to his own cunning but to divine assistance. The effect of the insertion is to put Laban in a still more unfavorable light; even his own daughters turn against him.

Vss. 17-18. Jacob's departure.

Verse 17 forms a natural sequel to vs. 3 (J) in which Jacob was commanded by YHWH to depart. The verse is to be assigned to J, along with the first few words in vs. 18 (to מקנהו), since it is inconceivable that Jacob left behind the flocks and herds which he had labored so hard and with such cunning to acquire. The remainder of vs. 18 is clearly P, as may be seen from the following: (i) רכוש ; (ii) פדן ארם (see App. C).

Vss. 19-29. Laban's pursuit.

Critics have detected numerous doublets in these verses and have, therefore, assigned the material to various hands (see App. D). It is essential that the story be examined in order to determine whether or not it is a unity.

After having Jacob leave (vs. 17), J brings Laban into the picture with the remark that while Laban was absent from home shearing the sheep, Rachel stole his teraphim (vs. 19). The play on the root

גנב (vs. 20), used previously in vs. 19, suggests that both verses are by the same hand. It is obvious that vss. 20-21 must be taken together since vs. 20 provides the necessary antecedent for הוא in vs. 21. When the news of Jacob's departure reaches Laban he immediately gathers his allies and pursues Jacob, overtaking him in Mt. Gilead (vss. 22-23). The mention of the three days is reminiscent of 30:36 (J). It would seem possible, therefore, to regard vss. 19-23 as a unity.

Verse 24 records a divine charge to Laban to restrain himself from saying anything to Jacob; yet in vs. 26 Laban begins to upbraid Jacob as soon as he meets him. Furthermore, the expression וישג in vs. 25 has the same meaning as וידבק in vs. 23, namely, "to overtake". Verses 24-25, therefore, may be regarded as secondary. The use of the divine name Elohim (vs. 24) suggests that these two verses are part of the E expansion of this chapter, evidence of which has already been found in vss. 4-16.

Much has been made of the supposed geographical problem, namely, that a period of seven days (vs. 24) is not sufficient to travel from Haran to Gilead. Since, according to 29:1 Jacob did not go to Haran but to the "land of the Bene Kedem", critics have advocated assigning vs. 24 (like 29:1) to E, suggesting that the land of Kedem was the unknown desert area to the east.[9] It has been suggested, however, that J thought of Haran as being situated in the land of Kedem (cf. 29:1). Volz has pointed out that while seven days may be insufficient time to travel from Haran to Gilead, it is more than enough time to make the short journey from the Damascus area (which he identifies with Kedem) to Gilead.[10] It would appear, therefore, that the question of geographical setting is of little help in determining authorship.

In vs. 26 reference is once more made to Jacob "deceiving" Laban (cf. vs. 20, J). Verse 27 forms a natural sequel to vs. 26. Therefore, these two verses are to be regarded as a part of the primary J narrative.

Verse 28 follows naturally after vs. 27 and can also be regarded as part of the J narrative. A reference in 32:1, which depicts Laban as kissing his (grand)sons and daughters goodbye supports this conclusion. Verse 29, however, refers to the dream mentioned in vs. 24 and must, like it, be regarded as from E.

Vss. 30-35. The search for the teraphim.

The story of the search for the teraphim appears to be basically a unity, with the exception of the words ובאהל שתי האמהת in vs. 33. Verse 33 begins with Laban entering Jacob's tent, then that of Leah. The verse ends with Laban emerging from Leah's tent, and entering Rachel's. Mention of the tent of the maids is unnatural in the context, and is generally recognized to be a later addition (see App. D). The maids are not essential to the dramatic effect of the story at this point since Laban is obviously concerned with his daughters. There would, therefore, be no reason why the original writer should have referred to them. A later writer may have felt that since they were in the party, they should not be ignored. Even though the maids were not original here, it does not follow that they played no significant role in the birth narratives. This episode continues the reference to Rachel stealing her father's teraphim (cf. vs. 19, J) and may thus be assigned to J.

Vss. 36-54. The covenant between Laban and Jacob.

These verses are regarded by critics as a classic example of a narrative composed of parallel strands (see App. D). Even Volz admits that two accounts are to be found here.[11] As in those parts of the Jacob Story studied previously, the evidence for J and E strands consists almost entirely of a number of alleged doublets: (i) two names are explained, Gilead (vs. 48) and Mizpah (vs. 49); (ii) two sacred markers are erected, a pillar (מצבה , vss. 45, 51, 52, 52) and a cairn (גל, vss. 46, 46, 48, 51, 52, 52, 52); (iii) a covenant feast is recorded twice (vss. 46 and 54); (iv) the agreement made between Laban and Jacob appears to have two different purposes: one a purely personal promise that Jacob will not mistreat Laban's daughters, the second symbolical of a boundary treaty between the Hebrews and Arameans.[12]

Critics have experienced difficulty in reaching agreement on the assignment of these doublets. Procksch, for example, arrives at conclusions directly opposite to those of Gunkel and Eissfeldt (see App. D). This in itself is sufficient to indicate that the evidence has been misused by some critics. The task of interpreting the verses is rendered more difficult by the uncertainties in the text. Verses 46 ff. are in quite a different sequence in the Septuagint, casting doubt on the reliability of the Hebrew text.

Before examining the covenant itself, it is desirable to discuss the conversation between Jacob and Laban (vss. 36-43). Jacob, enraged at Laban's insinuations that he or a member of his company was a thief, defends his reputation by pointing out all the benefits which had resulted from his stay in Laban's home and maintaining that he had at all times acted as an ideal shepherd. In several respects this speech by Jacob resembles vss. 4-16, which were assigned to E. For example, vs. 41, referring to the ten times that Laban had changed Jacob's wages, hearkens back to vs. 7 (E).

Verse 42 is certainly the work of E since the reference to the providential intervention of God is in keeping with vss. 4-16 (E), cf. also the reference to "last night" which refers to vs. 24, which was shown to be from E. It would appear, then, that part of vss. 36-42 presents a point of view in keeping with E's concept of how God aided Jacob. Verses 36-37, however, form a logical continuation of the J story, since it is only natural that Jacob should upbraid Laban because of the latter's false charge. These verses may be assigned to J, E having expanded the speech by adding vss. 38-42.

In vss. 43-54, the question of unity hinges primarily on the erection of both a pillar and a cairn by Jacob and Laban. Wellhausen, for example, suggested that references to the cairn should be regarded as secondary.[13] More recent critics have attempted to explain the mention of two markers as doublets to be assigned to J and E (see App. D). The narrative, however, can scarcely be pulled apart without losing its point. A *maṣṣebah* is set up by Jacob according to vs. 45, and then Jacob and his kinsmen make a cairn (vs. 46). Laban gives the cairn an Aramaic name, while Jacob calls it גלעד , the Hebrew equivalent. It is obvious that the cairn (גל) was introduced to explain the name גלעד. On the other hand, מצבה is most certainly intended to be a source for the derivation of the name המצפה in vs. 49 based on similarity of sound. What has obviously happened is that the author of this account felt compelled to work in two markers so that the origin of both parts of the compound place-name Mizpah of Gilead could be explained (cf. Jud. 11:29). Any attempt to pull apart the story by assigning parts to different strands misses the point and results in stories which lack adequate connecting links.

Verse 53 harks back to vs. 42 (E) and is doubtless by the same hand.

The analysis of ch. 31 suggested above may be tabulated as follows:

J--1-3, 17-18a (to מקנהו), 19-23, 26-28, 30-33*, 34-37, 43-52, 54;
E--4-16, 24-25, 29, 38-42, 53;
P--18a*, b, 33 (ובאהל שתי האמהת)?

NOTES ON CHAPTER VII

[1] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 341.

[2] Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 202; cf. Simpson, *ETI*, p. 105.

[3] Cf. Volz, *Der Elohist*, p. 94.

[4] *ETI*, p. 105.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[6] *Die Genesis*, p. 350; Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, p. 38; Holzinger, *Genesis*, p. 202.

[7] On the god *Bethel*, cf. J. P. Hyatt, "The Deity Bethel and the Old Testament," *JAOS*, LIX (1939), pp. 81 ff.; O. Eissfeldt, "Der Gott Bethel," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXVIII (1930), pp. 1-30.

[8] Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 341.

[9] Gunkel, *Genesis*, pp. 343-344; Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 395.

[10] *Der Elohist*, pp. 110-11.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

[12] Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 399.

[13] *Die Composition*, p. 42.

VIII GENESIS 32

This chapter relates Laban's departure for home, while Jacob moves on to Mahanaim (vss. 1-3). Jacob prepares to meet his brother Esau (vss. 4-22) and later wrestles with a supernatural being at Peniel (vss. 23-33).

Vss. 1-3. Laban and Jacob part company.

Most critics consider these verses to be a unity from the hand of E. The basis for this view is that these verses are said to follow logically after 31:53b-54, which they assign to E, and that the divine name Elohim is used in vs. 2 (see App. D). It is obvious, however, that Elohim is used with appellative force in vs. 2 as in 28:12, noted above, and cannot, therefore, be used as a criterion for source identification. The expression "angels of YHWH" never occurs. The use of Elohim in vs. 3 is dictated by its use in vs. 2. Verses 1-3 do follow 31:54, but since that verse was assigned to J, 32:1-3 may also be attributed to J.

Vss. 4-22. Jacob's preparations for his meeting with Esau.

Critics find two strands in these verses, chiefly on the ground that vss. 4-14a and 14b-22 appear to be doublets (see App. D). Gunkel, for example, noted that the story reached a point in vs. 14 which was not advanced by the following verses.[1] Verses 4-14a are generally assigned to J because of the following expressions: (i) יהוה (vs. 10); (ii) "the god of my father Abraham" (vs. 10, cf. 28:13); (iii) שפחה (vs. 6); (iv) מצא חן בעיניך (vs. 6); (v) the list of possessions (vs. 6, cf. 30:43); (vi) verses 10, 13a refer back to 31:3; (vii) verse 13b refers to 28:14.[2] The following section, vss. 14b-22, is therefore regarded as from E. While this evidence is impressive, some of it has been misconstrued by Gunkel and others, since arguments (i), (ii), (vi) and (vii) are based on usage in verses which Gunkel calls secondary (see App. D).[3] It has been shown previously that שפחה cannot be used as an indication of source (see pp. 175-176). Several expressions occur which are found elsewhere in C material: (i) יהוה האמר (vs. 10, cf. 16:13 יהוה הדבר); (ii) החסד(ים) ... האמת (vs. 11, cf. 24:27). Furthermore, the promise of descendants like the sand of the sea which cannot be counted for multitude (vs. 13) has been seen to be one of C's dominant themes (cf. 22:17 and 16:10). If these verses are assigned to C, the view of critics such as Simpson[4] that vss. 10-11 and 13 appear to be by a J writer later than his suggested date for J2 appears to be borne out.

Many critics regard שדה אדום in vs. 4 as a gloss (see App. D), but it is precisely the type of comment C would add to correlate this story with previous references to Esau as the forefather of the Edomites (cf. 25:25, 30). If vss. 4-14a come from the hand of C, it is possible to understand its references to earlier J material, as noted by Gunkel.

This section seems to be a "haggadic" play on the name Mahanaim. There is no hint in vs. 3 that the name was understood as a dual, but C interpreted it as such, vss. 8, 9, 11 making it clear that "two camps" are involved.[5] A play on the word מלאכים (vs. 2) is also to be detected in the statement that human מלאכים were sent to Esau (vs. 4).

In assigning vss. 14b-22 to E Skinner noted that "positive marks of that writer's style cannot be detected."[6] The only argument put forth by critics in favor of this assignment is the observation that in both vss. 14a and 22 Jacob is said to have spent the night at Mahanaim. While a theory of parallel strands is not entirely convincing, neither are the attempts to explain away the double mention of spending the night. Eerdmans, for example, argued that two nights were meant, with a full day intervening between vss. 14 and 22.[7] If this were the case, the writer might be expected to have made it more clear that a second night was in fact involved. Volz has attempted to explain the repetition as due to different emphases, vs. 14 stressing that Jacob stayed *there*, while vs. 22 makes the point that while the others passed on, *he* stayed there.[8]

Spending a night is required by vss. 23-33 which relate that Jacob moved on by night and encountered a divine being (vss. 25 ff.). If, as will be suggested below, vss. 23-33 are from J, it is probable that vss. 14b-22 are also from J. These verses would advance the basic story, last met in vss. 1-3, by having Jacob prepare and send on a gift to his brother Esau. C anticipated this by inserting the account of the messengers sent on ahead and the reminder of the splendid future previously promised Jacob by YHWH.

Vss. 23-33. The struggle at Peniel.

Taking his wives, concubines and eleven children, Jacob had them cross the Jabbok, while he was left alone.[9] It was there that he wrestled until dawn with a supernatural being, which led to his name being changed to Israel. Smend recognized the basic unity of these verses.[10] In this, he was followed by Eissfeldt, while most critics assign parts to several strands. There is, however, little agreement concerning the details (see App. D). Skinner comments that "the analysis of the passage is beset by insurmountable difficulties."[11] The basis for suggesting two or more authors is once more the presence of a number of so-called doublets: (i) laming the thigh (vs. 26a and vs. 26b); (ii) Peniel-Penuel (vss. 31-32); (iii) the request by Jacob to know the name of his antagonist (vss. 28-29 and vs. 30).[12] Simpson carries the matter further, adding (iv) verse 29 implies that Jacob was the victor, while vs. 31 indicates that Jacob was fortunate to escape alive; (v) seeing God (vs. 31) is foreign to the story which speaks only of striving.[13]

It is recognized by critics that the use of the divine name Elohim cannot be used as evidence of E authorship, since wrestling with YHWH would be unthinkable, and furthermore, the element el is needed for the etymologies offered for Israel and Peniel.

The more important features of this section may now be isolated. According to vs. 23 there were only eleven children in Jacob's party. Even if the writer wished to list the boys separately, some reference to Dinah is expected. The absence of any mention of her would seem to bear out the suggestion made in connection with 30:21, that Dinah is a secondary insertion in the birth story, made after the incorporation into the Jacob Story of the tradition about her found in ch. 34. This in turn would suggest that vs. 23 is from the hand of J. It should be noted as well that the handmaids are mentioned in vs. 23, which supports the view that their presence in the birth stories (chs. 29-30) is original. While it would appear that the last clause in vs. 23 is simply repeated in vs. 24, suggesting that two authors are responsible for these two verses, it need not be the case. Verse 23 states the result of Jacob's act, while the details of the crossing are related in vs. 24. Other examples of this form of narrative have been noted in the discussion of 27:23-27 above. Furthermore, it is impossible to separate vs. 23 from the following verses, since vs. 24 requires prior mention of the family. If the opening verses of the story are from J, it may be expected that the J source will be found in subsequent verses. The doubts expressed by several critics, noted above, concerning the validity of seeking more than one hand for this story appear to be well founded. By pulling the story apart, the tense dramatic character of the account is destroyed. While Peniel and Penuel appear to be doublets, it should be noted that both spellings are found elsewhere in the Old Testament and the author may have felt it desirable to mention both forms.[14]

Verse 33 is often regarded as redactional (see App. D), but since such a prohibition is not found elsewhere in the Old Testament, there would be little reason for its later insertion. It bears all the marks of a primitive food taboo and may be regarded as part of the basic J story.

Following the change of Jacob's name to Israel it might be expected that the narrative would henceforth refer to him by that name. Such is not the case, however, as will appear in subsequent chapters. It may be that P changed the name back to Jacob in order to accommodate his record of the change in name in ch. 35. This technique would be comparable to that used in connection with Abram-Abraham and Sarai-Sarah (see above on Gen. 17).

It is suggested that ch. 32 may be assigned to J and C as follows:

J--vss. 1-3, 14b-33;
C--vss. 4-14a.

NOTES ON CHAPTER VIII

[1] *Genesis*, p. 356.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 356.

[3] *Ibid*., pp. 318-319.

[4] *ETI*, p. 111.

[5] Cf. Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, p. 43.

[6] *Genesis*, p. 404.

[7] *Die Komposition*, p. 61.

[8] *Der Elohist*, p. 116.

[9] On the location of this episode cf. Simons, *GTTOT*, pp. 230-232.

[10] *Die Erzählung*, p. 86.

[11] *Genesis*, p. 407.

[12] *Ibid*., p. 407.

[13] *ETI*, p. 112.

[14] Cf. Simons, *GTTOT*, p. 231. See also: Jud. 8:8, 9, 17; I Kings 12:25.

IX GENESIS 33

Jacob and Esau finally meet but do so as friends (vss. 1-16). Jacob then moves on to Succoth (vs. 17) and thence to Shechem (vs. 18) where he purchases a field and erects on it an altar which he calls "El, the god of Israel" (vss. 19-20).

Vss. 1-16. Jacob and Esau meet.

Critics are generally agreed that most of this section is to be attributed to J.[1] Eissfeldt and Simpson assign it to a secondary J strand, J and J2 respectively (see App. D). In this they follow Smend.[2] Verse 4 is considered to be overloaded with the result that the expressions "he embraced him" and "he kissed him" (vs. 4) are assigned to E. Any judgment on "overloading" is purely subjective and therefore of limited value. It must be remembered that the meeting between the separated and anxious brothers is depicted as an emotion-filled affair which the writer was hard pressed to find adequate words to describe.

Verse 5b was assigned to E by Gunkel because the divine name Elohim is used and because only the children are referred to, whereas in the rest of the chapter the wives and children are mentioned together.[3] Smend suggested that vs. 5 breaks the logical connection between vss. 4 and 6.[4] This is scarcely true. The verse is an essential introduction to the dramatic scene in which the members of Jacob's family are presented in order of ascending importance (vss. 6-7).

Similarly, vs. 10b is assigned to E since Elohim is used. Gunkel admitted that this did not constitute sufficient grounds for an assignment to E, but did so since the verse refers to 32:21 which he called E,[5] but which the analysis above shows to be the work of J. Nor is the usual assignment of vs. 11a (which resembles vs. 5) to E justified. It is an integral part of the story.

It is here maintained that vss. 1-16 are a literary unit. The presence of the divine name Elohim in vss. 5 and 11 does pose a problem.[6] When it is recalled that in chs. 29-30, J's use of the divine names seems to be governed by political considerations, a similar solution may be suggested here. J may have deliberately avoided using the name YHWH in the conversation between Jacob and Esau to suggest that Esau (the ancestor of the hated Edomites) was now "outside the pale".

Since the preparation for the meeting with Esau (32:4-14a) was shown to be the work of C, it might be expected that this section is also from the hand of C, but 32:14b-22 (J) also sets the stage for such a meeting. If this analysis is correct, it should be noted that the meeting between Jacob and Esau is given considerable emphasis by J. The purpose is clearly to show that the original prediction concerning the fate of the two sons (27:40) was actually fulfilled.

Vss. 17-20. Jacob's journey to Shechem.

Jacob journeyed to Succoth which is said to owe its name to the sukkoth (booths) which he erected there. It is obvious from the word order, i.e., subject placed first, that vs. 17 is intended as a contrast to vs. 16, and is presumably therefore the work of the same author. It is usually assumed that the reference to Jacob's building a house for himself at Succoth implies that he spent some time there.[7] The author's concern, however, was to suggest the origin of the place-name Succoth, which is a plural formation. Since one "booth" would have been sufficient for Jacob and his family, the author has the booths designed for the use of the animals. The reference to Jacob building a house for his own use would seem to be merely complementary and too much stress should not be laid upon it.

Critics generally assign the first few words in vs. 18 (to שכם) to E, as well as the "b" part of the verse, while the remainder is from P (see App. D). The assignment to P appears to be justified, cf. פדן ארם . There is no good reason, however, why the first five words in vs. 18 cannot continue the J narrative in vs. 17. After his experience at Peniel, Jacob proceeds to Succoth and then to Shechem.[8]

Verse 19 is obviously intended to prepare the way for the inclusion of ch. 34 in the cycle of stories. Verse 20 records the erection and naming of an altar at Shechem. Further discussion of these two verses must be deferred until chs. 34 and 35 have been examined.

In summary, it is suggested that the material in this chapter may be assigned as follows:

J--vss. 1-18a (to שכם), 18b;
unassigned--vss. 19-20;
P--vs. 18a*.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IX

[1] Holzinger, Genesis, p. 211.

[2] Die Erzählung, p. 85.

[3] Genesis, p. 365.

[4] Die Erzählung, p. 85.

[5] Genesis, p. 365.

[6] The occurrence of Elohim in vs. 10 can be left out of account since the expression in which it occurs is an idiom which any writer might use.

[7] Cf. Skinner, Genesis, p. 415.

[8] The various views on the meaning of שלם, including the possibility that a place-name is involved, may be seen in Nielsen, Shechem, p. 223. It should be recalled that in 28:21 Jacob stated that if he returned בשלום to Bethel, YHWH would be his God. His successful return to Palestine may well be the point of 33:18.

X GENESIS 34

This chapter has confronted critics with one of their most perplexing problems. Meyer stated that it was the most difficult story in the entire Hexateuch to interpret.[1] As far as its literary structure is concerned, Dillmann was of the opinion that evidence of J and P was to be found in it.[2] Other critics, such as Wellhausen and Gunkel, assigned various parts to J and E.[3] On the basis of style, Skinner was willing to accept J and E as the circles in which the story arose, but he felt that the content of the story did not fit into either of the main J or E collections. He suggested, therefore, that while the two strands were products of J and E schools, they were not original at this point in the Jacob Story. The question of how they were added to the main J and E collections, when and how they were merged with one another and subjected to priestly annotation remained as "unexplained riddles".[4] Smend suggested the presence of three hands, J1, E and RP,[5] a view not unlike that of Simpson who favors J1, J2 and a secondary P strand.[6] Martin Noth has also suggested that the basic J story has been augmented by additions, although he does not attempt to date these additions.[7]

Before attempting to reach a decision on the questions of authorship and date, it is necessary to examine the arguments which have been advanced for believing that the narrative is composed of two strands. These are four in number:

(i) In vss. 6, 8-10, Hamor pleads on behalf of his son, yet in vss. 11-12 Shechem himself is represented as asking for Dinah's hand.

(ii) Dinah, after being seduced, appears to have been taken into Shechem's home from which she is rescued by force (vs. 26), but according to vs. 17 she appears to be still with her family.

(iii) According to vs. 19 Shechem fulfilled the agreement, whereas in vss. 20-24 Shechem and his father consult the people of the city to determine whether or not they will participate in it.

(iv) In vss. 27-29 all the sons of Jacob are involved in the destruction of the city, but in vss. 25, 30-31, it is Simeon and Levi alone who avenge the outrage to their sister and who are reprimanded by Jacob.[8]

These arguments for believing that two sources are interwoven fail to stand up to close scrutiny. Their chief weakness is that they do not recognize the presence in the story of an element of humour, centering around the eagerness of the young Hivvite prince, Shechem, to speed up the marriage. As soon as his father finishes speaking on his behalf, he hastens to plead his own case. When Jacob's sons lay down circumcision as the condition of any inter-marriage between the two groups, Shechem hurries and has himself circumcised. He cannot wait. There is no discrepancy between the reference to his action in vs. 19 and vss. 20-24 where Shechem and his father try to induce the other citizens of Shechem to agree to do likewise. Nor is there a discrepancy between vss. 17 and 26. Jacob's threat (vs. 17) to "take" his daughter and go strongly suggests that Dinah was still with "the daughters of the land" whom, according to vs. 1, she had gone to visit. In view of the drastic Hebrew laws on adultery (see Lev. 20:10; Dt. 22:22-24), she may well have been thought of as fearing to go home after her dishonour. The supposed discrepancy between vss. 25, 30-31 and vss. 27-29 is also found, on re-examination, to be without basis. Simeon and Levi are able, by themselves, to accomplish the slaughter of the inhabitants of Shechem because of the condition of the latter after submitting to circumcision. The plundering of a whole city, however, was beyond the capacity of two men, and so the story has all of Jacob's sons involved in this. According to vs. 27, as they entered the city, they came upon the corpses of the citizenry who had been slain by Simeon and Levi.

The suspicions which have been cast on the literary unity of the narrative seem once again to be the product of the a priori assumption that we are faced throughout by parallel strands. Attempts to discover further doublets so as to fill out two parallel accounts may be discounted. Simpson, for example, suggests that one account related the story of a rape, while in the other Shechem wooed Dinah,[9] but nothing in the rest of the story supports this idea. Similarly, to point to vs. 2b as an "overloaded" verse because three verbs are used in connection with Shechem's act is gratuitous. All attempts to pull the story apart result in a mutilation of the narrative. None of these attempts yields two strands which give any indication of having once existed as independent entities.

The literary relationship of the chapter to the other sources so far identified in Genesis must be explored. One feature which has impressed scholars is the occurrence in the chapter of a number of expressions which are regarded as characteristic of P. These are: נשיא (vs. 2), טמא (vss. 5, 13, 27), נאחז (vs. 10), כל־זכר (vs. 24), המל לכם כל־זכר (vss. 15, 22).[10] This might suggest either that the chapter is to be assigned to P or that it was annotated by P. The second alternative seems to be ruled out by the fact that it is impossible to delete the supposed annotations without marring the narrative; they seem to be an integral part of it. The first alternative would also seem to be ruled out by the fact that 35:5 (a passage which will be shown to be of non-P authorship below) implies a knowledge of ch. 34.

So-called P expressions have been encountered in C passages previously examined (see ch. 14), therefore assignment to C would create no problem. However, evidence of an E hand has been found in ch. 31, therefore the possibility of either J or E authorship for ch. 34 must be kept in mind. It seems unlikely that the chapter is the work of J since no other J passages have exhibited any so-called P features. Further discussion of the matter must be deferred until ch. 35 has been examined.

NOTES ON CHAPTER X

[1] Die Israeliten, p. 412.

[2] Die Genesis, p. 368; cf. also Procksch, Die Genesis, pp. 200, 543-544.

[3] Wellhausen, Die Composition, pp. 317 ff.; Gunkel, Genesis, p. 374.

[4] Genesis, p. 418.

[5] Die Erzählung, p. 93.

[6] ETI, p. 116.

[7] ÜP, p. 31.

[8] Skinner, Genesis, pp. 417-418.

[9] ETI, p. 117.

[10] Cf. Holzinger, Genesis, p. 213.

XI GENESIS 35

A number of final notes about Jacob have been compressed into this chapter:

(i) the burial at Shechem of the foreign gods possessed by some members of Jacob's party;

(ii) Jacob's move from Shechem to Luz-Bethel where he builds an altar;

(iii) the death and burial of Rachel's maid, Deborah;

(iv) God appears to Jacob, changes his name to Israel, foretells that kings and nations will issue from him and promises his descendants the land of Canaan;

(v) Jacob sets up a *maṣṣebah* at a spot which he names Bethel;

(vi) Jacob moves on southward; Rachel dies while giving birth to Benjamin near Ephrath-Bethlehem;

(vii) at Migdal-eder Jacob's eldest son Reuben commits incest with one of his father's concubines;

(viii) a list of Jacob's sons;

(ix) Jacob is re-united with his father Isaac at Hebron;

(x) the death and burial of Isaac.

Vss. 1-8. Jacob moves from Shechem to Bethel.

Critics are generally agreed that this section forms a literary unit although vss. 5-6 are sometimes attributed to other hands (see App. D). The internal evidence is, however, in favor of retaining these verses as integral parts of the narrative. Verse 1 relates the divine command to Jacob to leave (Shechem) for Bethel where he is to build an altar to the *'ēl* who appeared to him there when he fled from his brother Esau. Verses 2-4 relate the action taken by Jacob before setting out: he has the members of his household hand over to him their heathen gods and their ear-rings, and he buries them beneath the *'ēlah* at Shechem. Having severed all connections with their pagan past and having purified themselves by changing their clothes, they depart. No opposition is encountered from the Canaanite population because of a feeling of terror which God sent upon them (vs. 5). They arrive at Luz, which is identified with Bethel (vs. 6). The narrative hangs together well and it is impossible to delete vss. 5-6a without marring it seriously. The assignment of vs. 6a to P by some scholars is based on the assumption that the expression "the land of Canaan" occurs only in P. However, it was pointed out in dealing with 11:31; 12:5, etc. that it is inherently improbable that this expression was used only by P. There are, therefore, no adequate grounds for suspecting the literary unity of vss. 1-6.

Verse 7 relates the carrying out of the command in vs. 1 and may be attributed to the same source. Verse 8, which deals with the burial of Rebekah's nurse, Deborah, beneath the '*allôn* near Bethel, contains no clear marks of authorship but could well have been added by the author of vss. 1-7. It is likely that previous reference to Rebekah's nurse in 24:59 was intended to prepare for the incorporation of the tradition about Deborah at this point.

Critics have been virtually unanimous in attributing the bulk of the narrative in vss. 1-8 to E. There would seem to be justification for such an assignment in the fact that the divine name used is אלהים (vs. 1) or האלהים (vs. 7).[1] While in ch. 28, J employed Elohim in relating the origin of the name Bethel, it is difficult to conceive of any motive which might have led him in the present instance to use Elohim. It is worthy of note that the author of vss. 1-8 refers to the deity who appeared to Jacob at Bethel as "the '*el*" (vss. 1, 3). A Yahwistic writer would most certainly have made an identification with YHWH evident.

If these verses are assigned to E, it seems necessary in the light of vs. 5, which is clearly based on ch. 34, to regard ch. 34 as the work of E or an earlier hand. It was suggested above that ch. 34 is not likely the work of J. Chapter 34 and 35:1-8 are, therefore, best regarded as the work of E. This means that 33:19-20, which serve as an introduction to ch. 34, must also be assigned to E.

Vss. 9-13. Jacob's name changed to Israel.

There can be no doubt that critics are correct in assigning these verses to P (see App. D) in view of the presence of numerous characteristic P expressions: (i) פדן ארם (vs. 9); (ii) אל שדי (vs. 11); (iii) פרה ורבה (vs. 11, cf. 1:22, 28; 8:17; 9:1, 7; cf. also 28:3, all P); (iv) קהל וגוים (vs. 11, cf. 28:3 and המון גוים 17:4, 5, all P); (v) ויעל מעליו אלהים (vs. 13, cf. 17:22, P).

Verse 13b ("at the place where he spoke with him.") is often regarded as an intrusion, arising out of dittography from vs. 15.[2] It is true that the words occur three times in virtually identical form in vss. 13, 14, 15, but in view of P's tendency to redundancy it is doubtful if this is sufficient ground for assigning them to a non-P author.

Vss. 14-15. Jacob sets up a *maṣṣebah*.

Verse 14 is customarily regarded as the continuation of the E account last met in vs. 8, while vs. 15 is assigned to P (see App. D). There is nothing in ch. 28 which requires a sequel such as this, narrating Jacob's establishment of a sanctuary at Bethel. However, 35:14-15 shows that the story was later felt to require a statement to that effect. Chapter 28 mentions only the setting up of a *maṣṣebah*. It is required by 35:1 that there should be a subsequent reference to Jacob building an altar at Bethel and this requirement is met by vs. 7. There is nothing in vss. 1-8 which requires that Jacob set up a *maṣṣebah* at Bethel. Since the J narrative in 28:18-19 has already referred to Jacob setting up a *maṣṣebah* at Bethel and anointing it with oil and to his naming the place Bethel, the statement in 35:14-15 that he did the same things on returning to Bethel seems strange, whether the passage be attributed to P or to E. Since in vss. 1-8, E prefers the designation האל for the god of Bethel, the use of the term *Elohim* in vs. 15 may suggest P authorship. It is probable that vss. 14 and 15 are part of the P amplification beginning in vs. 9. They both presuppose a previous reference to God speaking with Jacob, such as is found in vss. 9-11 (P).

Vss. 16-20. *Rachel's death*.

Most critics assign these verses to E (see App. D). It is clear that the episode is the sequel to vss. 1-8, and should be assigned to E.

Vss. 21-22a. *Reuben's incest*.

The use of the name *Israel* in these verses rather than *Jacob* as hitherto in the story has led critics to assume that a different source is involved. Since the preceding narrative has been assigned by critics to E and P, this incident is assigned to J (see App. D). If 33:1-18 be from J, as was argued above, it is clear that J used the name *Jacob* for the patriarch even after the story in ch. 32 concerning the change of name to *Israel*. The assignment of vss. 21-22a to J seems to rest on the theory that the strand in the Joseph Story which employs the name *Israel* is by J, but this is to beg the question. The literary affinities of vss. 21-22a must, therefore, be determined on grounds other than the presence of the name *Israel*.

Fortunately, the problem is simplified by the fact that the verses contain two expressions which point to C authorship. These are: (i) ויט אהלה (see 12:8; 26:25; 33:19, all C); (ii) פילגש (see 22:24; 25:6, C).

C has worked in this story at the most appropriate place, since tradition had the incident take place at Migdal Eder (vs. 21), in the vicinity of Bethlehem.[3]

Vss. 22b-29. *The twelve sons of Jacob*. *The death of Isaac*.

These verses are universally assigned to P for the following reasons: (i) the reference to Paddan Aram (vs. 26); (ii) the chronological note (vs. 28); (iii) the expression "was gathered to his people" (vs. 29, see App. D). This assignment is unquestionably correct. It should be pointed out that P's account of Isaac's death fits poorly into the J account, which had Isaac at the point of death in ch. 27, even before Jacob left for Haran. P similarly sacrificed smoothness for the sake of his chronological scheme in connection with the death of Sarah and Abraham (see above on chs. 23-25).

The analysis of the chapter may be summarized as follows:

E--vss. 1-8, 16-20;

C--vss. 21-22a;

P--vss. 9-15, 22b-29.

R

NOTES ON CHAPTER XI

[1] In vs. 5 Elohim has appellative force and therefore cannot be used as evidence for source identification.

[2] E.g., Skinner, *Genesis*, p. 425.

[3] Simons, *GTTOT*, p. 220.

XII GENESIS 36

This chapter contains seven lists having to do with Esau, the Edomites and the inhabitants of Se'ir. Critical opinion is widely separated on the question of the literary affinities of the chapter with sources previously encountered in the patriarchal stories. Parts of vss. 1-9 and 40-43 are generally assigned to P, but regarding the other material no agreement has been reached, the most common view being that the various lists are to be derived from different hands, but that they were taken over by a J redactor (see App. D). Von Rad assigns all except vss. 20-39 to P, but he splits up the material, assigning vss. 9-14 and 40-43 to PA and vss. 1-8 and 15-19 to PB.[1]

(i) *Vss. 1-5*. *Esau's wives and children*.

Verse 1 is clearly the work of P, being an essential part of his *toledoth* scheme (see 2:4; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 19, all P). The list of Esau's wives given in vss. 2-5 differs in some noteworthy respects from that given by P in 26:34 and 28:9;[2] hence the verses must be from another hand. The passage contains no clear marks of its origin but in view of the fact that C rounded out the story of Abraham by giving a list of his Aramaean relatives (22:20-24) and a list of his South Arabian offspring (25:1-4), with the possibility that P's list of Abraham's North Arabian descendants in 25:12-16 was also derived from C, it seems inherently probable that C would round out his story of Jacob and Esau by giving a list of Esau's descendants. If that be so, vss. 2-5 may be attributed to him. It is possible, however, that vs. 5b is from the hand of P since such summarizing statements are characteristic of his style (cf. 10:20, 31; 25:16). Some doubt has also been cast on the originality of the expression "daughters of Canaan" in vs. 2 in view of the fact that one of Esau's wives is called a Hittite, another a Hivvite, and the third a daughter of Ishmael. There is, however, no contradiction here since "Canaan" is used as the name of a land and the author thinks of it as inhabited by more than one ethnic group.

(ii) Vss. 6-8. Esau's migration to Mt. Se'ir.

These verses may be assigned to P because of the following characteristic expressions: (i) נפש in the sense of "person" (vs. 6, cf. 12:5 etc.); (ii) רכש (vss. 6, 7; cf. 12:5 etc.); (iii) ארץ מגוריהם (vs. 7, cf. 28:4 etc.). This section seems to imply that after Jacob returned to Canaan, he and Esau lived together for a time at Hebron, their eventual separation being recorded at this point. In 33:16 (J) Esau is said to have returned to Se'ir after his meeting with his brother Jacob. In 35:29 P has Esau and Jacob bury their father Isaac at Mamre-Hebron just as he had Isaac and Ishmael bury their father Abraham there (cf. 25:9). In neither case does he refer to Ishmael or Esau journeying to Hebron for the ceremony; such a journey seems to be taken for granted. Verse 6 suggests that Esau returned to Hebron with all his household and livestock with the intention of remaining but, as in the case of Abraham and Lot, the land was unable to support both his herds and those of Jacob, so he went back to Seir-Edom.

(iii) Vss. 9-14. Esau's descendants.

Verse 9, with its reference to the *toledoth* of Esau, is manifestly by P. Verse 10 gives the names of the sons of Adah and Basemath, two of Esau's wives, but this information has already been given in vs. 4, which we have attributed to C. It is likely, therefore, that vs. 10 is by P. Note the similarity of vss. 9 and 10 to 25:12-13 (P). Verses 11-12a, which list the six sons of Eliphaz, appear to form the natural continuation of the C genealogy in vss. 2-5a. A mark of C authorship is to be found in the occurrence of the word פילגש (cf. 22:24; 25:6; 35:22, all C). Verse 12b is a summarizing clause similar to vs. 5b and probably therefore to be attributed to P. One would expect the list of the sons of Eliphaz to be followed by a list of the sons of Reuel, and such a list is found in vs. 13a, followed by a summarizing clause, 13b. It seems unlikely that C is responsible for the list of the sons of

Oholibamah given in vs. 14 since he has already given their names in vs. 5. The repetition must surely be due to P who wished to shape the genealogy according to a fixed pattern. If vs. 14 be from P, it seems likely that vs. 13, which is identical in pattern, is from P also.

(iv) Vss. 15-19. The Clan-Chiefs of Esau.

This list differs from that of C in that C does not list Qorah among the sons of Eliphaz, but as a son of Oholibamah (see vs. 5), and also mentions Gatam before Kenaz (vs. 11). While it may seem contradictory to list Qorah as a son of Eliphaz, since according to vs. 14 Qorah was called a son of Oholibamah, there may have been two Qorahs, or the writer may have wished to bring up the number of sons of Eliphaz to seven by including a Qorah at this point.

The structure of these verses is obviously similar to P's usual design, with each list summed up briefly (vss. 16b, 17b, 18b), vs. 19 serving as a general summary to the section as a whole (cf. 10:32).

Notice should be taken of the unusual word אלוף "chief, leader" found in these verses. Outside of this chapter the term occurs in the parallel account in I Chron. 1:51-54, also in Exod. 15:15 (the Song of Moses) and Zech. 9:7; 12:5, 6.

(v) Vss. 20-30. Two Horite lists.

A list of the tribes descended from Se'ir, the Horite, is offered in vss. 20-30. The seven sons of Se'ir are said to have had twenty sons and one daughter. The tradition according to which the Horites inhabited Mt. Seir before the Edomites appears to have been firmly established (cf. 14:6 and Dt. 2:12). The use of אלוף (vss. 21 and 29) suggests that the lists in their present form are from P.

(vi) Vss. 31-39. The Kings of Edom.

This section is assigned to J by various critics (see App. D) although they offer little evidence for this view. The list is unique in structure in Genesis and bears no clear marks of authorship.[3] The expression שדה מואב (vs. 35) is reminiscent of שדה אדום in 32:4

(C), but such a term may well have been used by more than one writer. It is difficult to see how such a list could fit into C's work which is concerned with the patriarchs and their descendants. Although the evidence is not at all clear, it is suggested that the repetitious nature of the list favors assignment to P, who may have felt it desirable to include in the Book of Genesis any other surviving traditions relating to the patriarchal period.

(vii) Vss. 40-43. A second list of Esau's chieftains.

There can be no doubt that this section is the work of P (see App. D). The word אלוף occurs frequently as in vss. 15-19 and 29-30 which were assigned to P. Furthermore the expressions למשפחת למקמתם (vs. 40) and למשבתם (vs. 43) are strongly reminiscent of ללשנו למשפחתם (10:5; P), למשפחתם ללשנתם (10:20, 31; P) and לתולדתם (10:32; P).

It would appear as if the bulk of this chapter is the work of P. Only vss. 2-5a and 11-12a appear to be of non-P authorship, and have been assigned to C. This does not cast doubt on the reliability of the evidence which P provides. It does suggest, however, that by P's time much more detailed information about the Edomite tribes and Edomite history had become available to the Jews.

NOTES ON CHAPTER XII

[1] Die Priesterschrift, pp. 31-33.

[2] P gives Esau's wives as follows:
Yehudith bath Beeri, the Hittite (26:34);
Basemath bath Elon, the Hittite (26:34);
Mehalath bath Ishmael (28:9).
According to Gen. 36:2-5 his wives were:
Adah bath Elon, the Hittite;
Oholibamah bath Anah bath Sib'on, the Hivvite;
Basemath bath Ishmael.

[3] Skinner, Genesis, p. 429.

XIII THE LITERARY DEVELOPMENT OF THE JACOB STORY

The chapter-by-chapter analysis of Genesis 25:19-36:43 has confirmed the generally accepted theory that the Jacob Story is not a literary unity. As in the Abraham Story, four stages in the literary growth have been detected: (i) a basic J narrative; (ii) supplements by an author who used the divine name Elohim and who is therefore designated as E; (iii) supplements by a Yahwistic writer who is designated by the symbol C; (iv) further supplements by P. Each of these stages will be examined in turn.

1. The basic J story.

The basic narrative, as isolated by the above analysis, is as follows: 25:21, 24-26a, 27-34; 27:1-45; 28:10-12, 16-22; 29:1-35; 30:1-20, 22-43; 31:1-3, 17-18a (to מקנהו), 19-23, 26-28, 30-33*, 34-37, 43-52, 54; 32:1-3, 14b-33; 33:1-18a (to שכם), 18b.

Following Isaac's prayer on behalf of his wife Rebekah, she bore twin boys who are named Esau and Jacob. The younger son, Jacob, subsequently managed to obtain the birthright from his older brother. Through deceit on the part of himself and his mother, he was able to obtain as well the paternal blessing which rightly belonged to Esau. As a result of this trickery Jacob had to leave home in order to save his life. He took the advice of his mother and headed for Haran to seek refuge with Laban, his mother's brother.

En route to Haran, Jacob spent the night at a spot where he experienced a theophany. Realizing that he had stumbled upon a holy place, he erected a commemorative pillar and named the spot Bethel. Continuing his journey, Jacob arrived at Haran and was received into Laban's household. After a month had passed, Laban offered to pay Jacob for working for him and it was agreed that Rachel, Laban's daughter, would be given to him as a wife in exchange for seven years' labor.

When the time for the marriage arrived, Laban deceived Jacob and he was married to Rachel's sister, Leah, instead. Thus Jacob was forced to pledge further labor in order to gain Rachel as his bride.

In due time eleven sons were born to Leah and Rachel and their two maids. Jacob asked to return to his homeland and suggested to Laban that he take as his share of the flocks which he had helped to build up the off-color animals as payment. Laban immediately agreed but then tricked Jacob once more by removing from the flocks the very animals which were to belong to Jacob. By means of an ingenious scheme of selective breeding Jacob was able to build up his flocks. This aroused the ire of Laban and his sons who became jealous of his success, so Jacob and his family fled without informing Laban. When Laban heard what had happened he pursued Jacob, finally overtaking him in the hill country of Gilead where he upbraided him for departing in such unseemly haste and for stealing his household gods. Following a heated exchange, the two men made a covenant at Mizpah of Gilead and erected both a pillar and a cairn as witnesses to the treaty. Laban returned home while Jacob continued his journey.

As he drew nearer home, Jacob endeavored to placate his brother Esau by sending on ahead generous gifts for him. At the Jabbok ford Jacob encountered a divine being who wrestled with him by night and informed him that his name was henceforth to be Israel. Jacob is said to have called the place Peniel or Penuel because there he saw God face to face. Jacob and Esau finally met and were reconciled. Esau departed for his homeland while Jacob moved on to Succoth and finally arrived at Shechem where he set up his tent outside the city.

The elements attributed to J form a continuous, well integrated unit. It appears as if in the Jacob Story, unlike the Abraham account, the J narrative has been more fully preserved. Perhaps it was more extensive to begin with. Its object seems to be to present a vivid picture of Jacob, the ancestor of the Israelites, with emphasis on his cleverness. As a result of his tactics Jacob outwits both Esau and Laban, and amasses considerable wealth as well as a large family. In this sense, the Jacob Story appears to be more secular in outlook than that of Abraham.

The divine name YHWH is normally employed (25:21; 27:7, 20, 27;

28:16, 21; 29:31-33, 35; 30:24, 27, 30; 31:3, 49) but the author has also seen fit to use Elohim in several passages. These are as follows: 28:20, where the naming of Bethel requires Elohim; 30:1-23, in the naming of some of Jacob's children (see pp. 175-178); 31:50, where Laban the Aramean is the speaker; 32:3, where the use of Elohim is dictated by the prior reference to the "angels of Elohim"; 32:29, 31, where Elohim is required to explain the names Israel and Peniel; 33:5, 11, where Jacob is speaking to Esau, the ancestor of the Edomites; and 33:10, where a reference to seeing YHWH would be unthinkable.[1]

Since Jacob is associated primarily with Bethel and Shechem it is probable that the Jacob legend originated in Israel not in Judah, as in the case of the Abraham account. It is impossible to be specific regarding a definite area within Israel where the particular account in question may have been promulgated. The relationship between the Abraham and Jacob narratives will be discussed in a concluding chapter.

An interesting allusion to the Jacob Story occurs in Hosea 12: 3-5 (EV 12:2-4):

> The LORD has an indictment against Judah,
> and will punish Jacob according to his ways,
> and requite him according to his deeds,
> In the womb he took his brother by the heel,
> and in his manhood he strove with God.
> He strove with the angel and prevailed,
> he wept and sought his favor.
> He met God at Bethel,
> and there God spoke with (him).

This does not prove that the writer of Hosea 12 was acquainted with the whole Jacob Story as it appears in J, but it is probable that the J story was in fixed form before the eighth century B.C., thus there is every likelihood that he was familiar with it.

It is difficult to be more specific regarding the date of J. The notion that Esau (Edom) is to serve Jacob (Israel) would suggest that a strong rivalry between Israel and Edom existed. It is possible that this reflects the time of the United Monarchy since David is said to have been the first to subdue Edom (see II Sam. 8:13-14), but it is impossible to be more definite.

2. The E supplement.

The following passages have been assigned to E: 30:21; 31:4-16, 24-25, 29, 38-42, 53; 33:19-20; 34:1-31; 35:1-8, 16-20.

The supplementary comments by E are apologetic in character, attempting to modify the impression left by the J narrative. It was not necessary for E to create new settings for his additional material, as in the case of the Abraham Story. Instead, E was able to accomplish his ends by means of additional speeches (see ch. 31).

The purpose of E's additions in ch. 31 seems to be to emphasize the fact that Jacob's prosperity is due to God's activity on his behalf rather than to his own cunning. Another effect of the additions is to present Laban both in his relationship to his daughters (31:14-15) and to Jacob (31:7-8) in a decidedly unfavorable light. This serves to justify Jacob's dealings with Laban, which according to the J version, come close to bordering on dishonesty. Jacob is depicted in the E supplements as an honest worker, the ideal shepherd (31:38-42), who had to fend for himself against a dishonest superior. The attempt to present Jacob in a better light is similar to the manner in which Abraham's character was "improved" by E in Genesis 20-21 (see above, pp. 120-121).

Considerable attention is devoted by E to Bethel. In 31:13 the Deity who addressed Jacob is called the El Bethel and reference is made to J's account of Jacob's erection of a pillar at Bethel (28:18). In ch. 35 Jacob is instructed to build an altar at Bethel. He does so, and names it El Bethel (vs. 7).

The longest E addition is ch. 34. E has prepared for this chapter by inserting a note regarding the birth of Dinah in 30:21. The secondary nature of this reference has been noted in connection with 32:23 where it appears as if the J narrative knows of only eleven children born to Jacob at Haran. A further preparatory note by E is found in 33:19-20 which records Jacob's purchase of some land near Shechem. It was noted in the analysis of ch. 34 that no clear marks of authorship are to be found (see pp. 200-202). This suggests that the story had received a relatively fixed form before being used by E.

The E material which has been detected in the Jacob Story is insufficient to permit any final judgment concerning its provenance and date. It appears likely that the growing moral sensitivity of the nation required that the patriarchs be presented in a better light, thus God's assistance in Jacob's rise to wealth is emphasized. While Bethel plays an important role in the E supplement it is impossible to fix on this as evidence for E having originated there.

3. The C supplement.

The following passages have been assigned to C: 25:22-23; 26:1-33; 28:13-15; 32:4-14a; 35:21-22a; 36:2-5a, 11-12a. Evidence has been found in the course of the analysis which leaves no doubt that this material is by the same hand as that designated as C in the Abraham Story. The chief features of C's work may now be noted.

To the four promises made to Abraham (see above, pp. 122-123) C has added two to Isaac (26:3-5, 24) and one to Jacob (28:13-14). Also included is a reference to an earlier promise that Jacob's descendants would be "as the sand of the seashore which cannot be numbered because of its multitude" (see above, p. 122). The fact that this brings the total of promises to the three patriarchs to seven can hardly be regarded as accidental, but suggests rather that C has attempted to compose a perfect number of promises. It is noteworthy that four of the seven promises are made to Abraham, leaving little doubt in the mind of the reader that Abraham was the most important of all. In the promise made to Jacob it is clear that this is an extension of the earlier promises since it is made by "the god of Abraham and Isaac", 28:13 (cf. also 32:10). Similarly, in the promise made to Isaac it is stated that the promise is given as a renewal of the promise to Abraham (26:3).

A feature of C's editorial work noted previously (see p. 128) is his insertion of oracles predicting the future of individuals and their descendants. A similar decree regarding the fate of Esau and Jacob is found in 25:22-23.

The pro-Judean bias of C noted in connection with chs. 14 and 15 (see above, p. 123) has been borne out by the distribution of promises noted above, and also by the fact that he has included traditions which present Judah in a favorable light. Thus, although Judah was the fourth son of Jacob (see 29:31-35), he emerges as the leading figure, at least by implication, following Reuben's incestuous act (35:22). Simeon and Levi, the second and third sons, had already been discredited by the treacherous manner in which they behaved toward the inhabitants of Shechem (see ch. 34). Judah now became the legal heir of his father's blessing, a view made explicit in Gen. 49 (see especially vss. 3-12). The fact that C's editorial additions to the Jacob Story are far less extensive than to the Abraham narrative serves to strengthen the impression that C reflects a pro-Judean viewpoint. He included a promise to Jacob but apparently had little other traditional information regarding the patriarch on which to draw.

The probable date of C's activity has been noted above (pp. 126-128). Evidence of some relationship between C's vocabulary and that long felt to be characteristic of P was observed in the analysis of the Abraham Story. Similar evidence is found in the Isaac Story: מלבד (26:1, found elsewhere in the Pentateuch only in material assigned to P) and הארצת (26:4, see Gen. 10:5, 20, 31, etc.).[2] While this evidence is slight, it suggests once more that C's date is probably not far removed from that of P.

4. The P additions.

The following passages were assigned to P: 25:19-20, 26b; 26:34; 27:46; 28:1-9; 31:18a*, b, 33 (ובאחל שתי האמהת); 33:18a*; 35:9-15; 22b-29; 36:1, 5b-10, 12b-43.

While P saw fit to add two substantial blocks to the Abraham Story (i.e., chs. 17 and 23), his comments on the Jacob material are brief. Two of his additions (26:35 and 28:1-9) seem designed to stress the importance which Isaac attached to purity of blood, a matter of great concern to post-exilic Judaism. Jacob's wealth is stressed in 31:18, while 35:9-15 gives P's version of the divine promises to Jacob and thus forms a counterpart to his version of the promises to Abraham in ch. 17. The traditions of the three Patriarchs are linked together by 35:22b-29 by having Jacob return to Hebron where he dies and is buried alongside Abraham and Isaac. Chapter 36 provides a list of Edomite descendants comparable to the Ishmaelites recorded at the conclusion of the Abraham Story (25:12-17).

To include the Isaac Story in his chronological scheme, P treated the first part of the Jacob Story as if it were the Isaac Story and introduced it with the inappropriate title "These are the toledoth of Isaac" (25:19). This forced P to put the title "These are the toledoth of Jacob" at the end of the Jacob Story (see 37:2). P was able, however, to work the material into his overall scheme. Isaac is said to have been forty years old when he married Rebekah (25:20) and sixty years of age when Esau and Jacob were born (25:26b). Esau was forty when he married (26:34), and Isaac died at the age of eighty (35:28). Rather oddly, no figures are given for Jacob.

There can be no doubt that P was the final reviser of the Patriarchal Stories.

NOTES ON CHAPTER XIII

[1] The use of Elohim as a common noun in 28:21 and 31:32 and its use as an appellative in the expressions "angels of Elohim" (28:12; 32:2) and "house of Elohim" (28:17, 22) naturally have no bearing on the question of authorship.

[2] BDB, p. 76, "almost wholly late".

PART IV

THE LITERARY GROWTH OF THE PATRIARCHAL TRADITIONS (GENESIS 12-36)

If a formula were used to summarize the view held by most literary critics concerning the literary growth of the Book of Genesis, the following might be suggested: $J^1 + J^2 = J + E\ (R^{JE}) = JE + P\ (R^P) =$ Genesis. To this one must add numerous glossators. The analysis carried out above suggests very strongly that this view stands in need of modification. It is suggested instead that three thorough and distinct revisions of the basic J story took place and that the literary history of Genesis should rather be expressed as follows: J + E + C + P.

A comparison of the Abraham and Jacob stories in their J form reveals certain differences. Thus in the Abraham Story, J never employs the divine name Elohim whereas in the Jacob Story both YHWH and Elohim occur, as noted above (see pp. 216-217). The Jacob Story is related with a much greater wealth of detail than is the account of Abraham. Jacob is presented as a clever man who outsmarts his opponents, whereas Abraham is depicted as a man of deep trust in YHWH. These differences can be explained if the two stories grew up in different parts of the country. Since Abraham is connected with the Hebron area whereas Jacob is associated primarily with Bethel and Shechem, it seems probable that the Abraham Story originates in Judah and that the Jacob legend developed in Israel.

It may be doubted, however, that the two legends ever existed separately in written form. A story of Israelite origin is not likely to have connected Jacob with Beersheba, yet in 28:10 Jacob is represented as setting out from there for Haran. This suggests that the two stories had been fused, either at the oral stage, or, more probably, that it was J who first brought them together.

The purpose of uniting traditions involving key "heroes" from both North and South may have been to foster national unity. This suggests the period of the United Monarchy as an appropriate time for J's activity. In connection with both the Abraham and Jacob stories, the possibility of relating J's work to the time of David has been noted (see pp. 120 and 217). If this was J's purpose, it seems likely that his work was officially inspired. To achieve the goal of uniting the separate parts of the nation, it would be necessary for J's work to have been communicated in more than casual fashion to the people. This could have been accomplished by reading or reciting it to the people on festival occasions or during other cultic ceremonies. Reference has been made above to the Abraham Story evidencing a character in keeping with cultic use (see p. 119). If during David's time the Jacob traditions were added by J to the account of Abraham, the combined story could well have been used in such a way. An investigation of the possible use of traditions in the cult lies beyond the scope of the present thesis; however, reference may be made to Weiser,[1] who has discussed the matter in some detail.

At a period which it has been found impossible to date with any precision, a supplement was appended to J by E. While the E material is not extensive, it appears likely that the supplementary material added to the Abraham Story and that incorporated into the Jacob narrative reflects common authorship. In both cases an apologetic motive has been seen. It appears as if some parts of E's work have been drawn from existing tradition, as has been noted in connection with chs. 22 and 34, while the attempts to rectify the image of Abraham (chs. 20-21) and of Jacob (ch. 31) are best understood as free compositions on the part of E.

No clear evidence of E's provenance has been found. Considerable attention is given to Beersheba (chs. 20-22) and to Bethel (see above, p. 218), but the material is not extensive enough to warrant an attempt to fix E's place of origin. It is likely, however, that the E revision was carried out at a major sanctuary, since if J had official status, the E revision of the tradition would have been officially inspired as well. It has been suggested that the growing moral sensitivity resulting from the teaching of the prophets motivated these additions. It is clear that the extent of J and E in the remainder of Genesis and in the Pentateuch as a whole must be determined before a more definite statement regarding the date of E can be made.

The most striking feature of C's supplement is its miscellaneous character. His work is clearly editorial, and can be understood as an attempt to gather up and put into writing traditions which had hitherto existed only in oral form. C has constructed a fuller Life of Abraham and has also incorporated into his work considerable traditional material concerning Isaac. The insertion of a cycle of tales concerning Isaac (ch. 26) has been noted above. If such a legend had been original in J it would in all probability have been placed between the stories of Abraham and Jacob, whereas C has worked it into the Jacob Story with some difficulty. Since the Jacob Story was relatively full in the JE version, C's additions to it were not as extensive, perhaps, as noted above (p. 220), because he had no further information concerning Jacob, or, he did not wish to amplify the Jacob Story out of all proportion to that of Abraham. In all likelihood, Jacob's role in Hebrew tradition had been superior to that of Abraham, judging from the paucity of references to Abraham in pre-exilic Hebrew literature. C, whose pro-Judean bias has been noted above (see p. 123), saw to it that Abraham was now presented as the leading figure among the forefathers of the Hebrews. This may also be seen from three additions on the part of C where the J story of Jacob appears to have been the model for his comments: (i) the blessing in 12:3 seems to echo 27:29; (ii) 14:20, which relates that Abraham presented a tithe to the High Priest of the Jerusalem sanctuary, may be designed to counteract the tradition in 28:22 that Jacob promised to give a tithe of his possessions to the Bethel sanctuary; (iii) chapter 24 which relates the meeting of Abraham's servant and Rebekah at a well is remarkably similar to the story in ch. 29 of the meeting of Jacob and Rachel at a well. It appears as if C attempted to include in his Life of Abraham certain events which were felt to reflect well on Jacob's character, thereby enhancing the picture of Abraham.

It has also been suggested that C is to be credited with the compilation and/or composition of the Yahwistic material in Genesis 1-11 (see above, pp. 127-128). This indicates that C's additions to the JE narrative are part of a larger literary enterprise. It also appears as if C's work is somewhat different from that of J and E in that he seems to have attempted to construct a story in which not only the Hebrew ancestors, but all of mankind is brought into the picture.

It is possible that a national catastrophe which threatened the existence of traditions known only in oral form may have prompted C's work. As Winnett has suggested, "the destruction of the Jewish state in 587 B.C. may well have provided the impetus for such an undertaking."[2] The evidence noted above suggests that C's date could fit this general period. It would be appropriate at such a time to recall the history of the Hebrew forefathers in an official historical record. The literary activity among the Hebrews during the sixth century B.C. is felt by some scholars to have been extensive.[3] If C's work was motivated by such a situation, it is probable that it too was official in nature, although no cultic connection is likely; in fact, the destruction of official worship may have provided the impetus for its production.

The work of P is best recognized as a still further revision of the C Life of the Patriarchs. P has imposed a chronological framework on the traditions and has added comments at various intervals in the story. The basis of P's chronological scheme may have been an existing "Toledothbuch" as von Rad has advocated (see p. 7) and as de Catanzaro has endorsed in his study of Gen. 1-11 (see p. 138), but the evidence in the Patriarchal narratives is insufficient to warrant final judgment. The generally accepted date for P is between 450 and 400 B.C.[4] There can be no doubt that P's work represents an official priestly revision of the tradition.

The aim of the present thesis has been to subject the Patriarchal traditions in Genesis to a literary analysis in an attempt to determine the manner in which the written traditions developed. The result of this study has been to propose a theory of literary growth which is based on more than linguistic and stylistic criteria in that both the importance of oral tradition and the possibility that the traditions were not only literary productions but were also used in the cult has been recognized. It has been demonstrated that the sources are not to be taken as parallel strands, but that successive supplements have been added to a basic narrative. This is not viewed by the present writer as a gradual process in which numerous hands participated. Instead, a basic story has undergone three distinct revisions, represented by the symbols E, C and P. This has furthermore rendered a theory of glossators and redactors unnecessary. The respect accorded to the Torah in Judaism makes it inherently improbable that tampering with the text would have been permitted or that revisions could have taken place without official sanction.

Thus, the thesis has revealed that literary analysis still has a function to perform. It must, however, be taken as the basis for further investigation which utilizes other methods as well in attempting to come to a more complete understanding of the biblical narratives.

NOTES ON PART IV

[1] *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, pp. 81-99.

[2] "Re-examining the Foundations," *JBL*, LXXXIV (1965), p. 18.

[3] See D. Winton Thomas, "The Sixth Century B.C.: A Creative Epoch in the History of Israel," *JSS*, VI (1961), pp. 33-46.

[4] Cf. Weiser, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, pp. 138-139.

APPENDIX A THE J NARRATIVE[1]

THE STORY OF ABRAHAM

Abraham's migration. (12:1) Now the LORD said to Abram, "Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you. (4) So Abram went, as the LORD had told him; and Lot went with him. (5*) When they had come to the land of Canaan, (6) Abram passed through the land to the place at Shechem, to the oak of Moreh. At that time the Canaanites were in the land. (7) Then the LORD appeared to Abram, and said, "To your descendants I will give this land." So he built there an altar to the LORD, who had appeared to him. (9) And Abram journeyed on, still going toward the Negeb.

Abraham and Sarah in Egypt. (12:10) Now there was a famine in the land. So Abram went down to Egypt to sojourn there, for the famine was severe in the land. (11) When he was about to enter Egypt, he said to Sarai his wife, "I know that you are a woman beautiful to behold; (12) and when the Egyptians see you, they will say, 'This is his wife'; then they will kill me, but they will let you live. (13) Say you are my sister, that it may go well with me because of you, and that my life may be spared on your account." (14) When Abram entered Egypt the Egyptians saw that the woman was very beautiful. (15) And when the princes of Pharaoh saw her, they praised her to Pharaoh. And the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house. (16) And for her sake he dealt well with Abram; and he had sheep, oxen, he-asses, menservants, maidservants, she-asses, and camels. (17) But the LORD afflicted Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of Sarai, Abram's wife. (18) So Pharaoh called Abram, and said, "What is this you have done to me? Why did you not tell me that she was your wife? (19) Why did you say, 'She is my sister,' so that I took her for my wife? Now then, here is your wife, take her, and be gone." (20) And Pharaoh gave men orders concerning him; and they set him on the way, with his wife and all that he had. (13:1) So Abram went up from Egypt, he and his wife, and all that he had, and Lot with him, into the Negeb.

---

[1] The translation is that of the Revised Standard Version. An asterisk indicates that less than an entire verse is included.

Abraham and Lot separate. (13:2) Now Abram was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold. (5) And Lot, who went with Abram, also had flocks and herds and tents, (7) and there was strife between the herdsmen of Abram's cattle and the herdsmen of Lot's cattle. At that time the Canaanites and the Perizzites dwelt in the land. (8) Then Abram said to Lot, "Let there be no strife between you and me, and between your herdsmen and my herdsmen; for we are kinsmen. (9) Is not the whole land before you? Separate yourself from me. If you take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if you take the right hand, then I will go to the left." (10*) And Lot lifted up his eyes, and saw that the Jordan valley was well watered everywhere[.] (11) So Lot chose for himself all the Jordan valley, and Lot journeyed east; thus they separated from each other. (12) Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan, while Lot dwelt among the cities of the valley and moved his tent as far as Sodom. (13) Now the men of Sodom were wicked, great sinners against the LORD. (18) So Abram moved his tent, and came and dwelt by the oaks of Mamre, which are at Hebron; and there he built an altar to the LORD.

Abraham and Hagar. (16:1) Now Sarai, Abram's wife, bore him no children. She had an Egyptian maid whose name was Hagar; (2) and Sarai said to Abram, "Behold now, the LORD has prevented me from bearing children; go in to my maid; it may be that I shall obtain children by her." And Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai. (4) And he went in to Hagar, and she conceived; and when she saw that she had conceived, she looked with contempt on her mistress. (5) And Sarai said to Abram, "May the wrong done to me be on you! I gave my maid to your embrace, and when she saw that she had conceived, she looked on me with contempt. May the LORD judge between you and me!" (6) But Abram said to Sarai, "Behold, your maid is in your power; do to her as you please." Then Sarai dealt harshly with her, and she fled from her. (7) The angel of the LORD found her by a spring of water in the wilderness, the spring on the way to Shur.

(8) And he said, "Hagar, maid of Sarai, where have you come from and where are you going?" She said, "I am fleeing from my mistress Sarai." (9) The angel of the LORD said to her, "Return to your mistress, and submit to her." . . .

A son promised to Sarah. (18:1) And the LORD appeared to him by the oaks of Mamre, as he sat at the door of his tent in the heat of the day. (2) He lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, three men stood in front of him. When he saw them, he ran from the tent door to meet them, and bowed himself to the earth, (3) and said, "My lord, if I have found favor in your sight, do not pass by your servant. (4) Let a little water be brought, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree, (5) while I fetch a morsel of bread, that you may refresh yourselves, and after that you may pass on--since you have come to your servant." So they said, "Do as you have said." (6) And Abraham hastened into the tent to Sarah, and said, "Make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make cakes." (7) And Abraham ran to the herd, and took a calf, tender and good, and gave it to the servant, who hastened to prepare it. (8) Then he took curds, and milk, and the calf which he had prepared, and set it before them; and he stood by them under the tree while they ate. (9) They said to him, "Where is Sarah your wife?" And he said, "She is in the tent." (10) He said, "I will surely return to you in the spring, and Sarah your wife shall have a son." And Sarah was listening at the tent door behind him. (11) Now Abraham and Sarah were old, advanced in age; it had ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women. (12) So Sarah laughed to herself, saying, "After I have grown old, and my husband is old, shall I have pleasure?" (13) The LORD said to Abraham, "Why did Sarah laugh, and say, 'Shall I indeed bear a child, now that I am old?' (14) Is anything too hard for the LORD? At the appointed time I will return to you, in the spring, and Sarah shall have a son." (15) But Sarah denied, saying, "I did not laugh"; for she was afraid. He said, "No, but you did laugh."

The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. (18:16) Then the men set out from there, and they looked toward Sodom; and Abraham went with them to set them on their way. (20) Then the LORD said, "Because the outcry against Sodom and Gomorrah is great and their sin is very grave, (21) I will go down to see whether they have done altogether according to the outcry which has come to me; and if not, I will know." (33) And the LORD went his way, when he had finished speaking to Abraham; and Abraham returned to his place. (22*) So the men turned from there, and went toward Sodom; (19:1*) [They] came to Sodom in the evening; and Lot was sitting in the gate of Sodom. When Lot saw them, he rose to meet them, and bowed himself with his face to the earth, (2) and said, "My lords, turn aside, I pray you, to your servant's house and spend the night, and wash your feet; then you may rise up early and go on your way." They said, "No; we will spend the night in the street." (3) But he urged them strongly; so they turned aside to him and entered his house; and he made them a feast, and baked unleavened bread, and they ate. (4) But before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, both young and old, all the people to the last man, surrounded the house; (5) and they called to Lot, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us, that we may know them." (6) Lot went out of the door to the men, shut the door after him, (7) and said, "I beg you, my brothers, do not act so wickedly. (8) Behold, I have two daughters who have not known man; let me bring them out to you, and do to them as you please; only do nothing to these men, for they have come under the shelter of my roof." (9) But they said, "Stand back!" And they said, "This fellow came to sojourn, and he would play the judge! Now we will deal worse with you than with them." Then they pressed hard against the man Lot, and drew near to break the door. (10) But the men put forth their hands and brought Lot into the house to them, and shut the door. (11) And they struck with blindness the men who were at the door of the house, both small and great, so that they wearied themselves groping for the door. (12) Then the men said to Lot, "Have you any one else here? sons-in-law, sons, daughters, or any one you have in the city, bring them out of the place; (13) for we are about to destroy this place, because the outcry against its people has become great before the LORD, and the LORD has sent us to destroy it." (14) So Lot went out and said to his sons-in-law, who were to marry his daughters, "Up, get out of this place; for the LORD is about to destroy the city." But he seemed to his sons-in-law to be jesting. (15) When morning dawned, the [men] urged Lot, saying, "Arise, take your wife and your two daughters who are here, lest you be consumed in the punishment of the city." (16) But he lingered; so the men seized him and his wife and his two daughters by the hand, the LORD being merciful to him, and they brought him forth and set him outside the city. (24) Then the LORD rained on Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven; (25) and he overthrew those cities, and all the valley, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and what grew on the ground. (27*) And Abraham went early in the morning (28) and he looked down toward Sodom and Gomorrah and toward all the land of the valley, and beheld, and lo, the smoke of the land went up like the smoke of a furnace.

THE STORY OF JACOB

The birth of Esau and Jacob. (25:21) And Isaac prayed to the LORD for his wife, because she was barren; and the LORD granted his prayer, and Rebekah his wife conceived. (24) When her days to be delivered were fulfilled, behold, there were twins in her womb. (25) The first came forth red, all his body like a hairy mantle; so they called his name Esau. (26*) Afterward his brother came forth, and his hand had taken hold of Esau's heel; so his name was called Jacob.

Esau sells his birthright to Jacob. (25:27) When the boys grew up, Esau was a skilful hunter, a man of the field, while Jacob was a quiet man, dwelling in tents. (28) Isaac loved Esau, because he ate of his game; but Rebekah loved Jacob. (29) Once when Jacob was boiling pottage, Esau came in from the field, and he was famished. (30) And Esau said to Jacob, "Let me eat some of that red pottage, for I am famished!" (Therefore his name was called Edom.) (31) Jacob said, "First sell me your birthright." (32) Esau said, "I am about to die; of what use is a birthright to me?" (33) Jacob said, "Swear to me first." So he swore to him, and sold his birthright to Jacob. (34) Then Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentils, and he ate and drank, and rose and went his way. Thus Esau despised his birthright.

Jacob obtains Isaac's blessing. (27:1) When Isaac was old and his eyes were dim so that he could not see, he called Esau his older son, and said to him, "My son"; and he answered, "Here I am." (2) He said, "Behold, I am old; I do not know the day of my death. (3) Now then, take your weapons, your quiver and your bow, and go out to the field, and hunt game for me, (4) and prepare for me savory food, such as I love, and bring it to me that I may eat; that I may bless you before I die." (5) Now Rebekah was listening when Isaac spoke to his son Esau. So when Esau went to the field to hunt for game and bring it, (6) Rebekah said to her son Jacob, "I heard your father speak to your brother Esau, (7) 'Bring me game, and prepare for me savory food, that I may eat it, and bless you before the LORD before I die.' (8) Now therefore, my son, obey my word as I command you. (9) Go to the flock, and fetch me two good kids, that I may prepare from them savory food for your father, such as he loves; (10) and you shall bring it to your father to eat, so that he may bless you before he dies." (11) But Jacob said to Rebekah his mother, "Behold, my brother Esau is a hairy man, and I am a smooth man. (12) Perhaps my father will feel me, and I shall seem to be mocking him, and bring a curse upon myself and not a blessing." (13) His mother said to him, "Upon me be your curse, my son; only obey my word, and go, fetch them to me." (14) So he went and took them and brought them to his mother; and his mother prepared savory food, such as his father loved. (15) Then Rebekah took the best garments of Esau her older son, which were with her in the house, and put them on Jacob her younger son; (16) and the skins of the kids she put upon his hands and upon the smooth part of his neck; (17) and she gave the savory food and the bread, which she had prepared, into the hand of her son Jacob. (18) So he went in to his father, and said, "My father"; and he said, "Here I am; who are you, my son?" (19) Jacob said to his father, "I am Esau your first-born. I have done as you told me; now sit up and eat of my game, that you may bless me." (20) But Isaac said to his son, "How is it that you have found it so quickly, my son?" He answered, "Because the LORD your God granted me success." Then Isaac said to Jacob, (21) "Come near, that I may feel you, my son, to know whether you are really my son Esau or not." (22) So Jacob went near to Isaac his father, who felt him and said, "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau." (23) And he did not recognize him, because his hands were hairy like his brother Esau's hands; so he blessed him. (24) He said, "Are you really my son Esau?" He answered, "I am." (25) Then he said, "Bring it to me, that I may eat of my son's game and bless you." So he brought it to him, and he ate;

and he brought him wine, and he drank. (26) Then his father Isaac said to him, "Come near and kiss me, my son." (27) So he came near and kissed him; and he smelled the smell of his garments, and blessed him, and said, "See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a field which the LORD has blessed! (28) May God give you of the dew of heaven, and of the fatness of the earth, and plenty of grain and wine. (29) Let peoples serve you, and nations bow down to you. Be lord over your brothers, and may your mother's sons bow down to you. Cursed be every one who curses you, and blessed be every one who blesses you!" (30) As soon as Isaac had finished blessing Jacob, when Jacob had scarcely gone out from the presence of Isaac his father, Esau his brother came in from his hunting. (31) He also prepared savory food, and brought it to his father. And he said to his father, "Let my father arise, and eat of his son's game, that you may bless me." (32) His father Isaac said to him, "Who are you?" He answered, "I am your son, your first-born, Esau." (33) Then Isaac trembled violently, and said, "Who was it then that hunted game and brought it to me, and I ate it all before you came, and I have blessed him?--yes, and he shall be blessed." (34) When Esau heard the words of his father, he cried out with an exceedingly great and bitter cry, and said to his father, "Bless me, even me also, O my father!" (35) But he said, "Your brother came with guile, and he has taken away your blessing." (36) Esau said, "Is he not rightly named Jacob? For he has supplanted me these two times. He took away my birthright; and behold, now he has taken away my blessing." Then he said, "Have you not reserved a blessing for me?" (37) Isaac answered Esau, "Behold, I have made him your lord, and all his brothers I have given to him for servants, and with grain and wine I have sustained him. What then can I do for you, my son?" (38) Esau said to his father, "Have you but one blessing, my father? Bless me, even me also, O my father." And Esau lifted up his voice and wept. (39) Then Isaac his father answered him: "Behold, away from the fatness of the earth shall your dwelling be, and away from the dew of heaven on high. (40) By your sword you shall live, and you shall serve your brother; but when you break loose you shall break his yoke from your neck." (41) Now Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing with which his father had blessed him, and Esau said to himself, "The days of mourning for my father are approaching; then I will kill my brother Jacob." (42) But the words of

Esau her older son were told to Rebekah; so she sent and called Jacob her younger son, and said to him, "Behold, your brother Esau comforts himself by planning to kill you. (43) Now therefore, my son, obey my voice; arise, flee to Laban my brother in Haran, (44) and stay with him a while, until your brother's fury turns away; (45) until your brother's anger turns away, and he forgets what you have done to him; then I will send, and fetch you from there. Why should I be bereft of you both in one day?"

Jacob's dream at Bethel. (28:10) Jacob left Beer-sheba, and went toward Haran. (11) And he came to a certain place, and stayed there that night, because the sun had set. Taking one of the stones of the place, he put it under his head and lay down in that place to sleep. (12) And he dreamed that there was a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold, the angels of God were ascending and descending on it! (16) Then Jacob awoke from his sleep and said, "Surely the LORD is in this place; and I did not know it." (17) And he was afraid, and said, "How awesome is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven." (18) So Jacob rose early in the morning, and he took the stone which he had put under his head and set it up for a pillar and poured oil on the top of it. (19) He called the name of that place Bethel; but the name of the city was Luz at the first. (20) Then Jacob made a vow, saying, "If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and clothing to wear, (21) so that I come again to my father's house in peace, then the LORD shall be my God, (22) and this stone, which I have set up for a pillar, shall be God's house; and of all that thou givest me I will give the tenth to thee."

Jacob marries Leah and Rachel. (29:1) Then Jacob went on his journey, and came to the land of the people of the east. (2) As he looked, he saw a well in the field, and lo, three flocks of sheep lying beside it; for out of that well the flocks were watered. The stone on the well's mouth was large, (3) and when all the flocks were gathered there, the shepherds would roll the stone from the mouth of the well, and water the sheep, and put the stone back in its place upon the mouth of the well. (4) Jacob said to them, "My brothers, where do you come from?" They said, "We are from Haran." (5) He said to them, "Do you know Laban the son of Nahor?" They said, "We know him." (6) He said to them, "Is it well with him?" They said, "It is well; and see, Rachel his daughter is coming with the sheep!" (7) He said, "Behold, it is still high day, it is not time for the animals to be gathered together; water the sheep, and go, pasture them." (8) But they said, "We cannot until all the flocks are gathered together, and the stone is rolled from the mouth of the well; then we water the sheep." (9) While he was still speaking with them, Rachel came with her father's sheep; for she kept them. (10) Now when Jacob saw Rachel the daughter of Laban his mother's brother, and the sheep of Laban his mother's brother, Jacob went up and rolled the stone from the well's mouth, and watered the flock of Laban his mother's brother. (11) Then Jacob kissed Rachel, and wept aloud. (12) And Jacob told Rachel that he was her father's kinsman, and that he was Rebekah's son; and she ran and told her father. (13) When Laban heard the tidings of Jacob his sister's son, he ran to meet him, and embraced him and kissed him, and brought him to his house. Jacob told Laban all these things, (14) and Laban said to him, "Surely you are my bone and my flesh!" And he stayed with him a month. (15) Then Laban said to Jacob, "Because you are my kinsman, should you therefore serve me for nothing? Tell me, what shall your wages be?" (16) Now Laban had two daughters; the name of the older was Leah, and the name of the younger was Rachel. (17) Leah's eyes were weak, but Rachel was beautiful and lovely. (18) Jacob loved Rachel; and he said, "I will serve you seven years for your younger daughter Rachel." (19) Laban said, "It is better that I give her to you than that I should give her to any other man; stay with me." (20) So Jacob served seven years for Rachel, and they seemed to him but a few days because of the love he had for her. (21) Then Jacob said to Laban, "Give me my wife that I may go in to her, for my time is completed." (22) So Laban gathered together all the men of the place, and made a feast. (23) But in the evening he took his daughter Leah and brought her to Jacob; and he went in to her. (24) (Laban gave his maid Zilpah to his daughter Leah to be her maid.) (25) And in the morning, behold, it was Leah; and Jacob said to Laban, "What is this you have done to me? Did I not serve with you for Rachel? Why then have you deceived me?" (26) Laban said, "It is not so done in our country, to give the younger before the first-born. (27) Complete the week of this one, and we will give you the other also in return for serving me another seven years." (28) Jacob did so, and completed her week; then Laban gave him his daughter Rachel to be her maid.) (30) So Jacob went in to Rachel also, and he loved Rachel more than Leah, and served Laban for another seven years.

Jacob's sons. (29:31) When the LORD saw that Leah was hated, he opened her womb; but Rachel was barren. (32) And Leah conceived and bore a son, and she called his name Reuben; for she said, "Because the LORD has looked upon my affliction; surely now my husband will love me." (33) She conceived again and bore a son, and said, "Because the LORD has heard that I am hated, he has given me this son also"; and she called his name Simeon. (34) Again she conceived and bore a son, and said, "Now this time my husband will be joined to me, because I have borne him three sons"; therefore his name was called Levi. (35) And she conceived again and bore a son, and said, "This time I will praise the LORD"; therefore she called his name Judah; then she ceased bearing. (30:1) When Rachel saw that she bore Jacob no children, she envied her sister; and she said to Jacob, "Give me children, or I shall die!" (2) Jacob's anger was kindled against Rachel, and he said, "Am I in the place of God, who has withheld from you the fruit of the womb?" (3) Then she said, "Here is my maid Bilhah; go in to her, that she may bear upon my knees, and even I may have children through her." (4) So she gave him her maid Bilhah as a wife; and Jacob went in to her. (5) And Bilhah conceived and bore Jacob a son. (6) Then Rachel said, "God has judged me, and has also heard my voice and given me a son"; therefore she called his name Dan. (7) Rachel's maid Bilhah conceived again and bore Jacob a second son. (8) Then Rachel said, "With mighty wrestlings I have wrestled with my sister, and have prevailed"; so she called his name Naphtali. (9) When Leah saw that she had ceased bearing children, she took her maid Zilpah and gave her to Jacob as a wife. (10) Then Leah's maid Zilpah bore Jacob a son. (11) And Leah said, "Good fortune!" so she called his name Gad. (12) Leah's maid Zilpah bore Jacob a second son. (13) And Leah said, "Happy am I! For the women will call me happy"; so she called his name Asher. (14) In the days of wheat harvest Reuben went and found mandrakes in the field, and brought them to his mother Leah. Then Rachel said to Leah, "Give me, I pray, some of your son's mandrakes." (15) But she said to her, "Is it a small matter that you have taken away my husband? Would you take away my son's mandrakes also?" Rachel said, "Then he may lie with you tonight for your son's mandrakes." (16) When Jacob came from the field in the evening, Leah went out to meet him, and said, "You must come in to me; for I have hired you with my son's mandrakes." So he lay with her that night. (17) And God hearkened to Leah, and she conceived and bore Jacob a fifth son. (18) Leah said, "God has given me my hire because I gave my maid to my husband"; so she called his name Issachar. (19) And Leah conceived again, and she bore Jacob a sixth son. (20) Then Leah said, "God has endowed me with a good dowry; now my husband will honor me, because I have borne him six sons"; so she called his name Zebulun. (21) Afterwards she bore a daughter, and called her name Dinah. (22) Then God remembered Rachel, and God hearkened to her and opened her womb. (23) She conceived and bore a son, and said, "God has taken away my reproach"; (24) and she called his name Joseph, saying, "May the LORD add to me another son!"

Jacob's bargain with Laban. (30:25) When Rachel had borne Joseph, Jacob said to Laban, "Send me away, that I may go to my own home and country. (26) Give me my wives and my children for whom I have served you, and let me go; for you know the service which I have given you." (27) But Laban said to him, "If you will allow me to say so, I have learned by divination that the LORD has blessed me because of you; (28) name your wages, and I will give it." (29) Jacob said to him, "You yourself know how I have served you, and how your cattle have fared with me. (30) For you had little before I came, and it has increased abundantly; and the LORD has blessed you wherever I turned. But now when shall I provide for my own household also?" (31) He said, "What shall I give you?" Jacob said, "You shall not give me anything; if you will do this for me, I will again feed your flock and keep it: (32) let me pass through all your flock today, removing from it every speckled and spotted sheep and every black lamb, and the spotted and speckled among the goats; and such shall be my wages. (33) So my honesty will answer for me later, when you come to look into my wages with you. Every one that is not speckled and spotted among the goats and black among the lambs, if found with me, shall be counted stolen." (34) Laban said, "Good! Let it be as you have said." (35) But that day Laban removed the he-goats that were striped and spotted, and all the she-goats that were speckled and spotted, every one that had white on it, and every lamb that was black, and put them in charge of his sons; (36) and he set a distance of three days' journey between himself and Jacob; and Jacob fed the rest of Laban's flock. (37) Then Jacob took fresh rods of poplar and almond and plane, and peeled white streaks in them, exposing the white of the rods. (38) He set the rods which he had peeled in front of the flocks in the runnels, that is, the watering troughs, where the flocks came to drink. And since they bred when they came to drink, (39) the flocks bred in front of the rods and so the flocks brought forth striped, speckled, and spotted. (40) And Jacob separated the lambs, and set the faces of the flocks toward the striped and all the black in the flock of Laban; and he put his own droves apart, and did not put them with Laban's flock. (41) Whenever the stronger of the flock were breeding Jacob laid the rods in the runnels before the eyes of the flock, that they might breed among the rods, (42) but for the feebler of the flock he did not lay them there; so the feebler were Laban's, and the stronger Jacob's. (43) Thus the man grew exceedingly rich, and had large flocks, maidservants and menservants, and camels and asses.

Jacob departs with his family. (31:1) Now Jacob heard that the sons of Laban were saying, "Jacob has taken all that was our father's; and from what was our father's he has gained all this wealth." (2) And Jacob saw that Laban did not regard him with favor as before. (3) Then the LORD said to Jacob, "Return to the land of your fathers and to your kindred, and I will be with you." (17) So Jacob arose, and set his sons and his wives on camels; (18*) and he drove away all his cattle[.] (19) Laban had gone to shear his sheep, and Rachel stole her father's household gods. (20) And Jacob outwitted Laban in the Aramean, in that he did not tell him that he intended to flee. (21) He fled with all that he had, and arose and crossed the Euphrates, and set his face toward the hill country of Gilead.

Laban pursues Jacob. (31:22) When it was told Laban on the third day that Jacob had fled, (23) he took his kinsmen with him and pursued him for seven days and followed close after him into the hill country of

Gilead. (26) And Laban said to Jacob, "What have you done, that you have cheated me, and carried away my daughters like captives of the sword? (27) Why did you flee secretly, and cheat me, and did not tell me, so that I might have sent you away with mirth and sons, with tambourine and lyre? (28) And why did you not permit me to kiss my sons and my daughters farewell? Now you have done foolishly. (30) And now you have gone away because you longed greatly for your father's house, but why did you steal my gods?" (31) Jacob answered Laban, "Because I was afraid, for I thought that you would take your daughters from me by force. (32) Any one with whom you find your gods shall not live. In the presence of our kinsmen point out what I have that is yours, and take it." Now Jacob did not know that Rachel had stolen them. (33*) So Laban went into Jacob's tent, and into Leah's tent, but he did not find them. And he went out of Leah's tent, and entered Rachel's. (34) Now Rachel had taken the household gods and put them in the camel's saddle, and sat upon them. Laban felt all about the tent, but did not find them. (35) And she said to her father, "Let not my lord be angry that I cannot rise before you, for the way of women is upon me." So he searched, but did not find the household gods. (36) Then Jacob became angry, and upbraided Laban; Jacob said to Laban, "What is my offense? What is my sin, that you have hotly pursued me? (37) Although you have felt through all my goods, what have you found of all your household goods? Set it here before my kinsmen and your kinsmen, that they may decide between us two.

The covenant at Mizpah. (31:43) Then Laban answered and said to Jacob, "The daughters are my daughters, the children are my children, the flocks are my flocks, and all that you see is mine. But what can I do this day to these my daughters, or to their children whom they have borne? (44) Come now, let us make a covenant, you and I; and let it be a witness between you and me." (45) So Jacob took a stone, and set it up as a pillar. (46) And Jacob said to his kinsmen, "Gather stones," and they took stones, and made a heap; and they ate there by the heap. (47) Laban called it Jegar-sahadutha: but Jacob called it Galeed. (48) Laban said, "This heap is a witness between you and me today." Therefore he named it Galeed, (49) and the pillar Mizpah, for he said, "The LORD watch between you and me, when we are absent one from the other. (50) If you ill-treat my daughters, or if you take wives besides my daughters, although no man is with us, remember, God is witness between you and me." (51) Then Laban said to Jacob, "See this heap and the pillar, which I have set between you and me. (52) This heap is a witness, and the pillar is a witness, that I will not pass over this heap to you, and you will not pass over this heap and this pillar to me, for harm. (54) Jacob offered a sacrifice on the mountain and called his kinsmen to eat bread; and they ate bread and tarried all night on the mountain. (55; Heb. 32:1) Early in the morning Laban arose, and kissed his grandchildren and his daughters and blessed them; then he departed and returned home. (32:1) Jacob went on his way and the angels of God met him; (2) and when Jacob saw them he said, "This is God's army!" So he called the name of that place Mahanaim.

Jacob prepares to meet Esau. (32:13*; Heb. 32:14*) [He] took from what he had with him a present for his brother Esau, (14) two hundred she-goats and twenty he-goats, two hundred ewes and twenty rams, (15) thirty milch camels and their colts, forty cows and ten bulls, twenty she-asses and ten he-asses. (16) These he delivered into the hand of his servants, every drove by itself, and said to his servants, "Pass on before me, and put a space between drove and drove." (17) He instructed the foremost, "When Esau my brother meets you, and asks you, 'To whom do you belong? Where are you going? And whose are these before you?'
(18) then you shall say, 'They belong to your servant Jacob; they are a present sent to my lord Esau; and moreover he is behind us.'" (19) He likewise instructed the second and the third and all who followed the droves, "You shall say the same thing to Esau when you meet him,
(20) and you shall say, 'Moreover your servant Jacob is behind us.'"
For he thought, "I may appease him with the present that goes before me, and afterwards I shall see his face; perhaps he will accept me."
(21) So the present passed on before him; and he himself lodged that night in the camp. (22) The same night he arose and took his two wives, his two maids, and his eleven children, and crossed the ford of the Jabbok. (23) He took them and sent them across the stream, and likewise everything that he had.

Jacob gains the name Israel. (32:24; Heb. 32:25) And Jacob was left alone; and a man wrestled with him until the breaking of the day. (25) When the man saw that he did not prevail against Jacob, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and Jacob's thigh was put out of joint as he wrestled with him. (26) Then he said, "Let me go, for the day is breaking." But Jacob said, "I will not let you go, unless you bless me." (27) And he said to him, "What is your name?" And he said, "Jacob." (28) Then he said, "Your name shall no more be called Jacob, but Israel, for you have striven with God and with men, and have prevailed." (29) Then Jacob asked him, "Tell me, I pray, your name." But he said, "Why is it that you ask my name?" And there he blessed him. (30) So Jacob called the name of the place Peniel, saying, "For I have seen God face to face, and yet my life is preserved." (31) The sun rose upon him as he passed Penuel, limping because of his thigh. (32) Therefore to this day the Israelites do not eat the sinew of the hip which is upon the hollow of the thigh, because he touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh on the sinew of the hip.

Jacob and Esau are reconciled. (33:1) And Jacob lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, Esau was coming, and four hundred men with him. So he divided the children among Leah and Rachel and the two maids. (2) And he put the maids with their children in front, then Leah with her children, and Rachel and Joseph last of all. (3) He himself went on before them, bowing himself to the ground seven times, until he came near to his brother. (4) But Esau ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell on his neck and kissed him, and they wept. (5) And when Esau raised his eyes and saw the women and children, he said, "Who are these with you?" Jacob said, "The children whom God has graciously given your servant." (6) Then the maids drew near, they and their children, and bowed down; (7) Leah likewise and her children drew near and bowed down; and last Joseph and Rachel drew near, and they bowed down. (8) Esau said, "What do you mean by all this company which I met?" Jacob answered, "To find favor in the sight of my lord." (9) But Esau said, "I have enough, my brother; keep what you have for yourself." (10) Jacob said, "No, I pray you, if I have found favor in your sight, then accept my present from my hand; for truly to see your face is like seeing the face of God, with such favor have you received me. (11) Accept, I pray you, my gift that is brought to you, because God has dealt graciously with me, and because I have enough." Thus he urged him, and he took it. (12) Then Esau said, "Let us journey on our way, and I will go before you." (13) But Jacob said to him, "My lord knows that the children are frail, and that the flocks and herds giving suck are a care to me; and if they are overdriven for one day, all the flocks will die. (14) Let my lord pass on before his servant, and I will lead on slowly, according to the pace of the cattle which are before me and according to the pace of the children, until I come to my lord in Seir." (15) So Esau said, "Let me leave with you some of the men who are with me." But he said, "What need is there? Let me find favor in the sight of my lord." (16) So Esau returned that day on his way to Seir.

Jacob journeys to Succoth and settles at Shechem. (33:17) But Jacob journeyed to Succoth, and built himself a house, and made booths for his cattle; therefore the name of the place is called Succoth. (18*) And Jacob came safely to the city of Shechem, and he camped before the city.

APPENDIX B EXPRESSIONS CHARACTERISTIC OF C

* indicates that all occurrences in Genesis are noted.
@ indicates that all occurrences in the Old Testament are noted.

אהלה	9:21; 12:8; 13:3; 35:21.*
אור כשדים	11:28, 31; 15:7;* cf. also Neh. 9:7.@
באכה	10:19, 19, 30; 13:10; 19:22; 25:18.*
ברך	Niph'al--12:3; 18:18; 28:14.@ Hithpa'el--22:18; 26:4.*
הרבה ארבה	3:16; 16:10; 22:17.*
כוכבי השמים	22:17; 26:4;* cf. 15:5.
לא יספר מרב	16:10; 32:13.*
נבט	Hiph'il--15:5; 19:17, 26.*
עתק	Hiph'il--12:8; 26:22.*
פילגש	22:24; 25:6; 35:22; 36:12.*
צער	13:10; 14:2, 8; 19:22, 23, 30, 30.* Cf. also Dt. 34:3; Isa. 15:5; Jer. 48:34.@
קרא בשם יהוה	4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25.*
שכן	Qal--9:27; 14:13; 16:12; 25:18; 26:2; 35:22; cf. also 49:13.* Hiph'il--3:24.*

APPENDIX C EXPRESSIONS CHARACTERISTIC OF P

* indicates that all occurrences in Genesis are noted.

אלוף	36:15 *et passim*.
אל שדי	17:1; 28:3; 35:11. Cf. also 43:14; 48:3; 49:25
ארץ מגורים	17:8; 28:4; 36:7. Cf. also 37:1; 47:9; 49:9.*
הוליד	5:3 *et passim*.
הקים ברית	6:18; 9:9, 11, 17; 17:7, 19, 21.*
נאסף אל־עמין	25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:29, 33.*
נפש	"person"--12:5; 17:14; 36:6 *et passim*.
פדן ארם	25:20; 28:2, 5, 6, 7; 31:18; 33:18; 35:9, 26.
פרה ורבה	1:22, 28; 8:17; 9:1, 7; 35:11. Cf. also 47:27.*
קהל גוים	35:11; cf. 28:3.
רכוש	12:5; 13:6; 14:11, 12, 16, 16, 21; 15:14; 31:18 Cf. also 46:6.*
רכש	12:5; 31:18, 18; 36:6; 46:6.*
תולדות	2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1, 32; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 13, 36:1, 9. Cf. also 37:2.*

graciously with me, and because I have enough." Thus he urged him, and he took it. (12) Then Esau said, "Let us journey on our way, and I will go before you." (13) But Jacob said to him, "My lord knows that the children are frail, and that the flocks and herds giving suck are a care to me; and if they are overdriven for one day, all the flocks will die. (14) Let my lord pass on before his servant, and I will lead on slowly, according to the pace of the cattle which are before me and according to the pace of the children, until I come to my lord in Seir." (15) So Esau said, "Let me leave with you some of the men who are with me." But he said, "What need is there? Let me find favor in the sight of my lord." (16) So Esau returned that day on his way to Seir.

Jacob journeys to Succoth and settles at Shechem. (33:17) But Jacob journeyed to Succoth, and built himself a house, and made booths for his cattle; therefore the name of the place is called Succoth. (18*) And Jacob came safely to the city of Shechem, and he camped before the city.

APPENDIX B EXPRESSIONS CHARACTERISTIC OF C

* indicates that all occurrences in Genesis are noted.

@ indicates that all occurrences in the Old Testament are noted.

אהלה	9:21; 12:8; 13:3; 35:21.*
אור כשדים	11:28, 31; 15:7;* cf. also Neh. 9:7.@
באכה	10:19, 19, 30; 13:10; 19:22; 25:18.*
ברך	Niph'al--12:3; 18:18; 28:14.@ Hithpa'el--22:18; 26:4.*
הרבה ארבה	3:16; 16:10; 22:17.*
כוכבי השמים	22:17; 26:4;* cf. 15:5.
לא יספר מרב	16:10; 32:13.*
נבט	Hiph'il--15:5; 19:17, 26.*
עתק	Hiph'il--12:8; 26:22.*
פילגש	22:24; 25:6; 35:22; 36:12.*
צער	13:10; 14:2, 8; 19:22, 23, 30, 30.* Cf. also Dt. 34:3; Isa. 15:5; Jer. 48:34.@
קרא בשם יהוה	4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25.*
שכן	Qal--9:27; 14:13; 16:12; 25:18; 26:2; 35:22; cf. also 49:13.* Hiph'il--3:24.*

APPENDIX C EXPRESSIONS CHARACTERISTIC OF P

* indicates that all occurrences in Genesis are noted.

אלוף	36:15 *et passim*.
אל שדי	17:1; 28:3; 35:11. Cf. also 43:14; 48:3; 49:25.*
ארץ מגורים	17:8; 28:4; 36:7. Cf. also 37:1; 47:9; 49:9.*
הוליד	5:3 *et passim*.
הקים ברית	6:18; 9:9, 11, 17; 17:7, 19, 21.*
נאסף אל־עמיו	25:8, 17; 35:29; 49:29, 33.*
נפש	"person"--12:5; 17:14; 36:6 *et passim*.
פדן ארם	25:20; 28:2, 5, 6, 7; 31:18; 33:18; 35:9, 26. Cf. also 46:15.*
פרה ורבה	1:22, 28; 8:17; 9:1, 7; 35:11. Cf. also 47:27.*
קהל גוים	35:11; cf. 28:3.
רכוש	12:5; 13:6; 14:11, 12, 16, 16, 21; 15:14; 31:18; 36:7. Cf. also 46:6.*
רכש	12:5; 31:18, 18; 36:6; 46:6.*
תולדות	2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1, 32; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 13, 19; 36:1, 9. Cf. also 37:2.*

APPENDIX D SYNOPSIS OF PREVIOUS CRITICISM

This summary is patterned after the second volume of H. Holzinger's Einleitung in den Hexateuch, in which he tabulated the critical views of a number of critics of his time. As representatives of the various views on the Patriarchal Stories he selected Dillmann, Wellhausen, Kuenen and Cornill. On the following pages the analyses of Gunkel, Procksch, Eissfeldt and Simpson, four representative critics of the twentieth century, are presented in summary form. This does not mean that the present writer is willing to commit himself to any of the views of these scholars, but their attempts have been thorough and have raised most of the relevant questions concerning the literary growth of the narratives requiring an answer.

Compactness has been the chief aim of this table. This has made it impossible to discuss in any way the reasoning which led a critic to arrive at a particular conclusion. Such material may be noted in the appropriate chapters discussed above. On several occasions the critics refused to commit themselves on specific problems. This has generally been marked by a question mark following the verse or verses involved. On some occasions, the notes of the critics proved to be contradictory, and only the intuition of the present writer could determine the final choice. Little account has been taken of the attempts to rearrange the text, although the verses are generally listed in the order suggested by a previous scholar to be more original than that in the present text. No attempt has been made to note substitutions in the text, a solution resorted to by Simpson, nor the numerous deletions for the sake of metre, suggested especially by Procksch. Only those textual changes which serve to illustrate and clarify a critic's theory of literary growth have been recorded.

GUNKEL

Ch	Ja	Jb	E	P	R	Glosses
11	28-30*			26-27 31-32		באור־כשדים -28
12	1-4a 6-8*	10-20*		4b-5	9	עד...מורה -6a 6b מקדם לבית־אל -8 16b^{b} ואת־ביתו -17
13	2, 5, 7a 8-10* 11a*,12b^{b}-13 18	1*		6 11b-12ab^{a}	3-4 14-17	ולוט עמו -1 7b לפני...יהוה -10 לוט^{2} -11
14	Not part of the major sources, "sondern von jeher als selbständiges Stück gedacht ist." Genesis, p.288.					
15		1*, 2a 3b-4, 6 9-10,12a^{a},b* 17-18ab^{a}	כמחזה, אל...לך -1 3a, 5 11, 12a^{b} 13a, 14*,16			2b, 7-8 חשכה גדלה -12b 13b, ברכש גדול -14 18b^{b}-21
16		1b-2, 4-7a 8, 11-14 25:18		1a, 3 15-16	9-10	7b
17				1-27*		יהוה -1 ובין...אחריך -10
18	1-16* 20-22a* 33b				17-19 22b-33a	סלת -6 ועמרה -20

PROCKSCH

Ch	J*	Ja	E	P	Redactional
11		28-30*		26-27 31-32	באור כשדים -28
12	10-20*	1-4a 5b^{b}-9		4b-5ab^{a}	ואת־ביתו -17
13		1-3 5, 7a 8-11a* 12b^{b}-18*		6 11b-12ab^{a}	4, 7b באכה צער -10 מן...שם -14
14				1-24*	9, מלך -10 בן־אחי־אברם -12 אל...וארץ -22
15	1ab^{a}, 3, 4 8-12a 17, 18a		1b^{b}, 2*, 5 6, 12b, 13a 14a, 16, 15		יהוה -2 הוא דמשק -2 7, 13b, 14b 18b-21
16	20:1a^{b} 16:2, 4-8, 11-14 25:18			1, 3 15-16	9-10
17				1-27a*	17, 27b
18		1-17* 20ab^{a} 21-33			סלת -6 18-19 20b^{b}

EISSFELDT

Ch	L	J	E	P	
11		28-30*		26-27 31-32	
12	1-2 4a 6-8	3 10-20*		4b-5	ם
13	2, 5 7-11a* 12b^{b}-18	1*		6 11b-12b^{a}	
14				1-12a* 13-24*	12b,
15		1b^{b} ~~2a~~ 7-12* 17-18	1ab^{a*}, 3-6* 13-14* 16 19-21		2b, ה ה ים גדלה -1 ול
16		1b-2 4-7a 11-14		1a, 3 15-16	
17				1-27*	ר
18	1b-2 4-9* 16, 22a	1a, 3, סלת -6 10-15, 17-21* 22b-33			

EISSFELDT				SIMPSON						
J	E	P	Redactional	J^1	J^2	E	P	R	Glosses	Ch
28-30*		26-27 31-32	28-באר־כשדים		28-30*		26-27 31-32	28-תרח (RP)	28-באור כשדים	11
3 10-20*		4b-5	9 16- ואתנת וגמלים 17- ואת־ביתו	1, 4a 6*, 7 8ab^{a*}	2-3a 8-ויקרא..י' 9-20		4b-5		6b, 6a-עד...שכם, 3b 8b- בית־אל...מקדם ועבדים ושפחת or 16- ואתנת וגמלים 17- ואת־ביתו	12
1*		6 11b-12b^{a}	1- ולוט עמו 3-4 10- לפני...עמרה 10- כארץ מצרים	2a, 5b 7-10 11a^{a}, 12b^{b} 13, 18	1* 3* 5a		6 11b-12ab^{a}	11a^{b} (RP) 14-17	1- ולוט עמו 3- ועד־בית־אל 4, 7b 10- לפני...עמרה 10- כגן־יהוה 10- באכה צער	13
		1-12a* 13-24*	10- מלך 12- בן...אברם 14- יליד ביתו, 12b, 22- יהוה	"late material".						14
1b^{b} 2a 7-12* 17-18	1ab^{a*}, 3-6* 13-14* 16 19-21		4- יהוה, 1- יהוה, 2b, מאור, 6- יהוה חשכה, 7- כשדים 13- ארבע..שנה, 12- גדלה 15, 14- ברכש גדול	"late material throughout". Perhaps vss.8-21 contain a nucleus which once stood between 13:17 and 13:18.						15
1b-2 4-7a 11-14		1a, 3 15-16	7b 8-10		1b-2, 4-8 11-12 25:18*	13-14*	1a, 3 15-16	1-מצרית 7b, 9 13-יהוה	10 25:18-באכה אשורה	16
		1-27*	1- יהוה 10- ובין...אחריך				1-27			17
1a, 3, 6- סלת 10-15, 17-21* 22b-33			20- ועמרה	1-2 4-9* 22a	3 7-ויתן..הנער 10-15* 16,20-21,33b			17-19 22b-33a	6- סלת 14- כעת חיה	18

	GUNKEL						PROCKSCH					EISSFELDT				
Ch	Ja	Jb	E	P	R	Glosses	J*	Ja	E	P	Redactional	L	J	E	P	Redacti
19	1-16* 23-25* 27-28* 30b-38			29	17-22 ולוט בא -23 צערה 26 -27 אל..יהוה 30a	-1 שני המלאכים -4 אנשי סדם -4 כל־העם מקצה -9 ויאמרו גש־הלאה -9 ויגשו.הדלת, -9 בלוט -12 חתן ו -15 המלאכים -24 ועל־עמרה -24 מן־השמים -25 ואת...הערים -28 ועמרה -29 בהפך...לוט		1-28* 30-34ab^{a} 35-38		29	-4 אנשי סדם -9 ויאמרו, בלוט -12 חתן ו -16 וינחהו...לעיר -24 מן־השמים 34b^{b}	1-16* 17a^{b}b-18, 20b 22b-23a 24b 26 30-38	-4 אנשי סדם כל־העם -4 מקצה ויאמרו -9 גש־הלאה ויגשו... -9 הדלת -12 ובניך..בעיר 17a^{a}, 19-20a 21-22a 23b-24a, 25* 27-28*		29	לאכים ם ה ים האל
20			1-17		18		1a^{b}		1a^{a} 1b-18					1-17*		ושפחת 1
21		1a, 2a 6b-7 25-26 28-30 32-33	6a 8-24* 27 31	1b* 2b-5	34	-1 יהוה -10 עם־יצחק -12 ועל־אמתך	6b	25-26 28-31a 32-34 1b, 2a 7	22a^{b}b-24 27 31b 1a 6a 8-20	2b-5 21	22a^{a} -22 ופיכל...צבאו -9 אשר...לאברהם		1a 2a 7	1b* 6 8-34*	2b-5	
22			1-14* 19		15-18 20-22 & 23b-24(Jr)	-3 ויבקע...עלה -21 אבי ארם 23a		20-24	1-14 19a		15-18 (RJE) 19b		20-24	1-19*		המריה ליך -11, יהוה -14, יראה
23				1a, 2* 3-18 19*, 20		1b -2 הוא חברון -19 הוא חברון				1-20					1a 2-20	1b

APPENDIX D--Continued

EISSFELDT					SIMPSON						
L	J	E	P	Redactional	J^{1}	J^{2}	E	P	R	Glosses	Ch
16* 8, 20b -23a 4b 6 -38	-4 אנשי סדם כל־העם -4 מקצה ויאמרו -9 גש־הלאה ויגשו... -9 הדלת -12 ובניך..בעיר 17a^{a}, 19-20a 21-22a 23b-24a, 25* 27-28*		29	-1 שני המלאכים -15 המלאכים -24 ועל־עמרה -25 את־הערים האל -25 הערים -28 ועמרה	1b-4a* 5-6a*, 7-8 9a*, 10-12* 13a, 16* 24* 27a, 28* 30-34ab^{a} 35-38	1a* בחמלת... -16 עליו -24 ועל־עמרה -28 ועמרה		29	שני -1 המלאכים 13b^{a} 14-15 17-23 25-26 27b 28a^{b}	-4 אנשי סדם 4b, 6b -9 ויאמרו גש־הלאה 9b -12 חתן...ובנתיך -12 מן־המקום 13b^{b} -16 וביד־אשתו -24 מן־השמים 34b^{b}	19
		1-17*		-14 ועבדים ושפחת 18	1a		1b-9* 11-12 14-16* -7 כי..בעדך and 17 (E2)		13	-4 הגוי -9 ועל־ממלכתי 10 -14 ועבדים ושפחת 18	20
	1a 2a 7	1b* 6 8-34*	2b-5	-1 יהוה -33 יהוה	1a 2a* 6b	-2 לזקניו 25ab^{a} 26, 28-30 31a 32b-33	6a^{b} 8-10* 14-20 21b,22-24* 27 31a	2b 3-5	6a^{a}(RP), 7 -9 המצרית 11-13 -22 ויהי... -22 ופיכל.. 25b^{b},32a,34	1b -2 שרה -10 עם־יצחק -12 ועל־אמתך 21a	21
	20-24	1-19*		-2 אל...המריה -2 על...אליך יהוה -11, יהוה יראה -14, 14b -16 יהוה		20	1a^{a} 1b-13 14a 19a		14b 15-18 19b,23a(RP) 21-23b 24	1a^{b} -2 את־יצחק -2 המריה -2 על...אליך -3 ויבקע...עלה	22
			1a 2-20	1b				1-20			23

250

GUNKEL

Ch	Ja	Jb	E	P	R	Glosses
24	1a, $2a^a$,3-4* יהוה ... השמים -7* 7b,9b,אל־ארם נהרים-10 $11b^b$, $12a^a$,b $14b^b$, ואיש ידעה...-16 17a,21*,23a 24*, 26-29 $32b^b$, 37-38 40b, 42, 44b 47a*, 48-49 $50a^b$, 51-56 59, 61b, 66 $67a^b$,b* 25:11b	1b, 25:5 $2a^b$,b, 5-6 7a*, 8-9a 10*, $11ab^a$ $12a^b$,13-$14b^a$ 15, 16* 17b-20והאיש מחריש..-21 22, 23b, 25 30-$32ab^a$ 33-34, 35-36 39-40a, 41 43-44a,45-46 47b, $50a^{a*}$,b 57-58,60-61a 62*,63-65 ויבאה ... האהלה, ויאהבה -67a*			שרה אמר -67a אמר -67b	ליצחק -4 וילך -10 לבתואל בן־ -15 בתואל, בן -24 בתואל בן־ -47 בתואל -50 בא ... והוא -62
	11b	5 18		7-11a 12-17	1-3a, 4, 6*	3b אל־ארץ קדם -6
25	**J**	**E**	**P**	**R**	**Glosses**	
	21-$25a^a$,b* 26a, 27a* 27b*, 28	$25a^b$ איש שדה -27a ישב אהלים -27b 29-34	19-20 26b		שני -23 30b	

PROCKSCH

Ch	J*	Ja	E	P	Redactional
24	1b,זקן ביתו -2a 2b, 4a, 7 9a, $10a^a$ אל ... נהרים -10b $11b^a$, 12, $14b^b$ 15a, 16*, 17-19 $20a^b$b, 21, $22a^a$ 23a, 24, 26-28 29b, 31-32a 33-37, 40b 42b, 45a*,b $46a^a$, 47a 48-$50a^b$, 51-53 56a, 60-61a 63, 65, 66 $67a^a$,b		1a, 2a*, 38a 4b-6, 8, 9b $10a^b$,b*, 11a,b^b 13-14a,b^a, 15b ותרא העינה-16 $20a^a$, $22a^b$,b 23b, 25, 29a 30, 32b, 38-40a 41-42a, 43-44 וכדה על־ שכמה-45a $46a^b$b, 47b $50a^a$,b, 54-55 56b-59, 61b 62, 64, $67a^b$		
		1-3a, 4-5 11b, 18		7-11a 12-17	3b 6
25	21-23 אדמוני -25 $27a^a$ איש...ציד-$27a^b$ $27b^b$ 28		24-26a $27a^{b*}$ $27b^a$ 29-34	19-20 26b	

EISSFELDT

Ch	L	J	E	P	Reda
24		1, $2a^a$,b, 3-4 7, 9, $10a^a$,b^b $11ab^a$, 12-$22a^a$ 23a, 24, 26-28 29b, 31-$32ab^b$ 33-37, $38a^b$b 40*, $41a^b$b-47a 48-56, 59 61b-62a 63-64a 65-$67a^a$,b*	$2a^b$, 5-6, 8 $10a^b$,b^a $11b^b$, $22a^b$b 23b, 25, 29a 30, $32b^a$ $38a^a$, 39 ומבית אבי -40 $41a^a$, 47b 57-58, 60-61a 62b, 64b $67a^b$		אמר ,
	1-6 11b	18*	11a	7-10 12-17	רה
25	21-26* 29-34	27a* 27b* 28	איש שדה -27a איש תם -27b	19-20 26b	

APPENDIX D--Continued

EISSFELDT				SIMPSON						
J	E	P	Redactional	J^1	J^2	E	P	R	Glosses	Ch
1, $2a^a$,b, 3-4 7, 9, $10a^a$,b^b $11ab^a$, $12\text{-}22a^a$ 23a, 24, 26-28 29b, $31\text{-}32ab^b$ 33-37, $38a^b b$ 40*, $41a^b b$-47a 48-56, 59 61b-62a 63-64a $65\text{-}67a^a$,b*	$2a^b$, 5-6, 8 $10a^b$,b^a $11b^b$, $22a^b b$ 23b, 25, 29a 30, $32b^a$ $38a^a$, 39 40- ומבית אבי $41a^a$, 47b 57-58, 60-61a 62b, 64b $67a^b$		67- שרה אמו, אמו		1b, 25:5, 2 3b, 4a, 7,9 10*, $11ab^a$ 12a*, 13 $14ab^a$,16-20 $22a^a$, 23a 24, 26, 27a 28, $31ab^a$ $32a^b$,b^b 33-35a 36-38a, 40b $42ab^a$,43-47a 48a, 49-50a 51-54,59,61b 63-64a,65-66 $67a^b b$	1a, 3a, 5 6,8, אל־ארם 10- נהרים $11b^b$,12b $14b^b$, 15, 21 $22a^b b$, 23b 25, 27b,29a 30, $31b^b$ $32a^a$,b^a, 39 40a, $41a^a$ $42b^b$, 47b 48b, 50b 57-58*, 60 55-56a, 61a 64b, $67a^{a*}$		4b 12- אברהם 16- והנער והצליח 40- דרכך $41a^b b$ 57- ויאמרו 56b 62	16- בתולה 29b 35b 38b 67- שרה אמו	24
18*	11a	7-10 12-17	18- באכה אשורה	11b	5 18		7-11a 12-17	1-4 6		25
27a* 27b* 28	27a- איש שדה 27b- איש תם	19-20 26b	25- ארמני	21*, 24 25-26a* 27* 29-34a*	21- רבקה 22-23 27- איש ... ציד, 28 30b? 34b		19-20 26b		25- ארמני 27- ישב אהלים	

	GUNKEL					PROCKSCH					EISSFELDT				
Ch	J	E	P	R	Glosses	J*	Ja	E	P	Redactional	L	J	E	P	Re
26	1a^{a}, b וירא... ויאמר-2a 3a, 6-14, 16-17 19-23 25a^{b}, b-33*	2a*, b	34-35	1a^{b} 3b-5 15, 18 24-25a^{a}	בינינו ובינך-28	1a^{a}, b 2-3a 6-14 16-17 19-33			34-35	1a^{b} 3b-5 (RD) 15 18	1a^{a}, b, 2a 3a, 6-14 16-17 19-23 25a^{b}b-33	2b 3b^{a} 24-25a^{a}	3b^{b}-5a	34-35	
27	1a, הגדל...-1b 2-3, 4b-6, הביא לי ציד -7 לפני יהוה -7 15, 19b-20 24-27*, 29a^{a}, b יעקב...-30a 30b, 31b, 33-34 41b-42, חרנה-43 44, 45a^{b}, b	1b*, 4a, 7* 8-14, 16-19a* 21-23, 28 29a^{b}, 30a* 31a, 32 35-41a, 43* 45a^{a}		46	ואת־הלחם-17 ויבא ... וישת-25	1a^{a}, 2-3, 4b, 5 הביא לי ציד-7 לפני יהוה-7 15, 18b^{b}, 19-20 24-27, 29a^{b}, b יעקב...-30a 30b, 31a^{b}, b, 32-34 37a^{a}, b, 38, 40 41b^{a}, 43b 44		1a^{b}, b, 4a 6, 7*, 8-14 16-18ab^{a} 21-23, 28, 29a^{a} 30a*, 31a^{a} 35-36, 37a^{b} 39, 41ab^{b} 42, 43a 45	46			1a, הגדל...-1b 2-14 16-18* 19-23 29a^{a} 29b 30* 31-36a 41b עד...ממך-45	1b* 15 ואת־הלחם -17 ויאמר.הנני-18 24-28* 29a^{b} ויהי..אביו-30 36b-41a 42-44 45*	46	
28	10, 13 15-16 19a	11-12 17-18 20-21a, 22	1-9*	14* 21b	ואל־אמו-7 ובזרעך-14 19b	10, וילך השמש... -11 13-16, 21, 19		11*, 12 17-20 22	1-9			13-16* 19	10-12, 17-18 20-22*	1-9	
29	2-14 26 31-32ab^{a} 33-35	1, 15-23 25, 27-28a 30, 32b^{b}	24 28b-29			2-14a, 19b, 23b 25b^{a}, 26, 27a 28a, 30a 31-35		1, 14b-19a 20-23a, 25a, b^{b} 27b 30b	24 28b-29		1-3, 7-8, 10b 14b-17a 18-23 25-28a 30	6ab^{a} 9-10a 12-13* 14a 31-35	4-5, 6b^{b} 11, ... ויחבק לו^{2} -13 17b	24 28b-29	
30	1a^{a}, 3b^{b}, 9a 10-12a, 13* 14-16, 20*, 21 22b^{b}, 24b, 25 27, 29-31* הסר וטלוא... -32	1a^{b}, b-3ab^{a} 4b-8*, 12b, כי...בנות-13 17-18a^{a}, b, 19 ותאמר...טוב-20 22b^{a}, 23 יוסף...-24a	4a 9b 22a		בלהה ... רחל -7 עם־אחתי -8 18a^{b} ואת־ילדי -26 אשמר -31 וכל...בכשבים -32 וחום...בכשבים -33	1a^{a}, 3b^{b}, 4-5 6b, 7a^{b}, 9-12a ותאמר באשרי...-13 14-16, 18b, 19a הפעם בנים... -20		1a^{b}, b, 2, 3ab^{a} 6a, 7a^{a}, b, 8 12b, 13*, 17 18a, 19, 20* 22b^{a}, 23a? 23b, 24a*, 26 אשמר-31	22a	לאמר -24	29-31* הסר..וטלוא -32 לפניך -33	1a, 3b^{b}, בלהה רחל... -7 9a, 10-12* 13*, 14-16 20*, 22b^{b} 24*, 25, 27 אשמר -31	1b-3b^{a} 4b-7* 8 בן שני-12 כי...בנות-13 17-19*	4a 9b	

APPENDIX D--Continued

EISSFELDT					SIMPSON						
L	J	E	P	Redactional	J^{1}	J^{2}	E	P	R	Glosses	Ch
, 2a 6-14 6-17 9-23 ^{b}b-33	2b 3b^{a} 24-25a^{a}	3b^{b}-5a	34-35	1a^{b} 5b 15 18	1a^{a},b, 2a^{a} 3a, 6, 7-14 16-17, 19-22 23*, 25a^{b},b 26-29a 30-33	1a^{b}, 2a^{b} רבקה-8 ויברכהו יהוה -12b באר שבע-23 24, 25a^{a}		34-35	2b, 3b-5 15 18	גררה -1 פן ... רבקה -7 מגרר -26 בינינו ובינך -28 29b	26
	1a, הגדל...-1b 2-14 16-18* 19-23 29a^{a} 29b 30* 31-36a 41b עד...ממך-45	1b* 15 ואת־הלחם -17 ויאמר.הנני-18 24-28* 29a^{b} ויהי..אביו-30 36b-41a 42-44 45*	46	יהוה -27		2-3, 4b-5 15, 18b^{b}-20 25-27,29a^{a},b 30a^{a},b, 31b 32, 33a,36a 33b-34,38a^{a} 41b,חרנה-43	1, 4a,6-14* 16-17*, 18ab^{a} 21-22, 23b 28, 29a^{b} 30a^{b}, 31a 35, 36b, 37 38b-40, 41a 42-45*		הביא לי ציד -7 לפני יהוה-7 24 38a^{b} 46	תליך וקשתך-3 ואת־הלחם-17 23a ויבא ... וישת-25 45a^{a}	27
	13-16* 19	10-12, 17-18 20-22*	1-9	ובזרעך -14 יהוה -21		10b, 13 15-16 19	10a, 11-12 17-18 20-22a	1-9	14 יהוה -21 22b	ובזרעך-14	28
7-8, 10b 14b-17a 18-23 25-28a 30	6ab^{a} 9-10a 12-13* 14a 31-35	4-5, 6b^{b} 11, ... ויחבק לו^{2} -13 17b	24 28b-29		1-2, 7-9 10b, 12 לקראתו.-13a^{a} 14b, 26 31-35	3-6, 10a^{a} 11 13a^{b},b* 14a	ויחבק ... לו^{2} -13 15, 16-23 25, 27 28a, 30a^{a},b	24 28b 29	26 30a^{b}	לא ... המקנה-7 10a^{b}	29
29-31* הסר.. -32 לפניך-33	1a, 3b^{b}, בלהה רחל... -7 9a, 10-12* 13*, 14-16 20*, 22b^{b} 24*, 25, 27 אשמר -31	1b-3b^{a} 4b-7* 8 בן שני-12 כי...בנות-13 17-19*	4a 9b	שפחתי -18	21, 22a,b^{b} 23a, 24 29-30a^{a},b 31, 32a* 34? 35b, 36 37a^{a},b*,38*	1a^{a}, 3b^{b} 9a,...כי בנות-13 14-16, 20a* 20b?, 25 27, 30a^{b}	1a^{b},b, 2 3ab^{a}, 4b* 5-6*, 7*, 8* 10-13*, 17b 18a^{a},b, 19 ותאמה.טוב-20a	4a 9b	יעקב -4 שפחת ... רחל -7 שפחת ... לאה -10 שפחת ... לאה -12	וגם ... בקולי-6 ותהר ... ו-7 עם־אחתי-8 ואת־ילדי-26 וטלוא...בעזים-32 ולוז וערמון-37	30

	GUNKEL					PROCKSCH					EISSFELDT				
Ch	J	E	P	R	Glosses	J*	Ja	E	P	Redactional	L	J	E	P	Reda
30 cntd.	35*, 36 37*, 38* 39b* 40* 41-43	26*, 28, 32* 33*, 34, 37-ולוז וערמון מחשף ... 37- המקלות בשקתות ... 38- לשתות 39a 40-ויתן...לבן			35-וכל...בכשבים 39-עקדים 40-וכל־חום	21, $22b^b$, 23a? 24b, 25, 27 29-31*, $32a^b$ 35-36*, $37a^b$ 38*, 39b, 40b 41-43		$32a^a$,b, 33-34 כל^2 35-..כבשים $37a^a$,b, בשקתות 38-...לשתות 39a 40a*		40-וכל־חום	34-35* 36-38* 39 41-43	32*, 33* וכל ... 35- בכשבים בשקתות ... 38- לשתות ויחמנה... 40- לשתות	20-ותאמר..טוב $21-22b^a$ ותאמר ... 24- יסף 26 28		
31	1, 3, 19a 21, 25, 27 31b, 36a 38-40 44, 46* 48*, 51* 52*, 53a*	2, 4-9*, 11 $13-18a^a$ 20, 22-24 26, 28-31a 32-35* 36b-37 41-43*, 45* 49b-50 53b 54*	$18a^bb$		7- אלהים 10, 12, 19b 33- ובאהל...האמהת 42- אלהי אברהם ו 47, 46- יעקב, 45- יעקב 48- לבן, 49a 51- והנה המצבה 52- ועדה המצבה 52- ואת־המצבה הזאת 53a- אלהי אביהם 54- יעקב	1, 3, 20-23* 26, 27b, 31 36a, 38, 39,40 42a, 10, 12, 45, 49, 50,51b 53b		2, 4-9, 11 $13-18a^a$, 19 24-25, 27a 28-30, 32-34 35, 36b, 37 41, 42b,43-44 46-48, 51a 53a	$18a^b$,b	20-הארמי 21-ויקם	1, 3, 19 $21a^a$,b, 22-23 27b, 30 32*, 33* 34a, 35-36a 44a, 46, 48 51* 52*	$25ab^a$, 27a 32-נגד...לך ובאהל שתי 33-האמהת 34b*, 36b-40 42a, 44b-45 51-והנה.ובינך 52-ועדה המצבה לא^1, 52-לא^2, ואת־ 52-המצבה הזאת 53-54	2, 4-9 11 $13-18a^a$ 20, $21a^b$ 24, $25b^b$ 26, 28-29 31, 41 42b-43 49* 50	$18a^bb$	אהל
32	4-9* 14a 23, 25b 26b 30-31 32b	1-3 14b-22 24-25a 26a 27-29 32a		10-13 33	4-שדה אדום	4*, 5-14a 23, 24b, 25b 26b, 27a 30-31		1-3 4- שדה אדום 14b-22, 24a 25a, 26a, 27b 28-29 32-33a		33b?	24b-33*	וישב ... 1-למקמו 4* 5-14a 21* 23	1*, 2-3 4-שדה אדום 14b-20 21-כי...לפני 22 24a		שה
33	1-4* 5a 6-10a 11b-17	4- ויחבקהו 4- וישקהו 5b, 10b-11a 18*, 19-20*	אשר ... 18- ארם		19-אבי שכם	1-4, 6-10 11b-17 18*		5, 11a 19*, 20	אשר... 18-ארם	19-אבי שכם	18b אשר... 19- אהלו	1-4*, 6-10 11b-17*, 19* 20	4-ויחבקהו 5, 11a 18a-ויבא.העיר	18a*	

	EISSFELDT				SIMPSON						
	J	E	P	Redactional	J^1	J^2	E	P	R	Glosses	Ch
5* 8* 3	32*, 33* וכל ... 35- בכשבים בשקתות ... 38- לשתות ויחמנה... 40- לשתות	20-ותאמר..טוב 21-22b^a ותאמר ... 24- יסף 26 28			39b* 40b 43	41-42	20b?, 22b^a 23b, 26* 28, וכל... 32a- בכשבים 32b-33 34?		17a 18a^b 35a 39b- עקדים	37-מחשף ...המקלות 38-בשקתות...לשתות 39a, 40a	30 cntd.
19 22-23 0 3* 5-36a 6, 48 * *	25ab^a, 27a 32-נגד...לך ובאהל שתי 33-האמהת 34b*, 36b-40 42a, 44b-45 51-והנה.ובינך 52-ועדה המצבה לא^1, לא^2-52, ואת־ 52-המצבה הזאת 53-54	2, 4-9 11 13-18a^a 20, 21a^b 24, 25b^b 26, 28-29 31, 41 42b-43 49* 50	18a^{b}b	10 12 34- את־כל־האהל 47 49- יהוה	1a, 19, 21a^a 22, 23a, 25ab^a 26a^a, 30b 32*, 33, 34a 35, 44b, 46 51, 52, 48	1b, 3, 20a 21a^b, 26a^b 30a, נגד... 32-גנבתם 36a, 37-40 53a	2, 4-5a 6-7, 13* 14-16, 17-18a^a 21b, 23b 24(E2), 26b 27-28, 29(E2) 31, 36b, 41 42a, 42b(E2) 43, 44a, 45 49-50, 53b 54	18a^{b}b	8-12* 20- הארמי 24- הארמי 30- ועתה והנה 51- המצבה ועדה 51- המצבה ואת־המצבה 51- הזאת	5b 13-אשר ... נדר 20b, 25b^b 33-ובאהל שתי האמחת 33-באהל־יעקב ו 34b, 37-כי 42-אלהי אברהם ו 47 53-אלהי אביהם	31
-33*	וישב ... 1-למקמו 4* 5-14a 21* 23	1*, 2-3 4-שדה אדום 14b-20 21-כי...לפני 22 24a		33- בגיד הנשה	1b 25b, 26a 27-29 30b, 32a	4-9* 10-11,13 (J, later than J^2), 24a 14a, 26b, רעם 29-־אנשים 30a, 32b	1a, 2-3 14b-22a 23a^{b}b		22b 23a^a 24b 25a	4-שדה אדום 12 23-ואת־שתי שפחתיו 33	32
18b א 19- אהל	1-4*, 6-10 11b-17*, 19* 20	4-ויחבקהו 5, 11a 18a-ויבא.העיר	18a*	13- והבקר		1-16* 17a^a 19	4- ויחבקהו 5- וישקהו 11a, 17a^{b}b 20	אשר... 18*-כנען	1-יעקב, 10b 17- יעקב בבאו, 18- שלם 18-...ארם	18-עיר	33

	GUNKEL					PROCKSCH					EISSFELDT				
Ch	J	E	P	R	Glosses	J*	Ja	E	P	Redactional	L	J	E	P	Redac
34	ויקח ... 2- ^{2}אתה 3 5* 7 11-12* 14* 19 25a* $26a^{b}b$ 29b 30-31*	1, 2a,b* 4, 6 8-10* 13a* 15-17 18a*, 20 21-24*, ויהי 25a-ביום השלישי 25b, 27a 28; 29a			5- כי ... בתו 8- אתם 11- אל־אביה ו 13- את־שכם ... אביו 13b 14- אליהם 18b 20- ושכם בנו, (עיר)ם 20- (עיר)ם 24- ואל־שכם בנו 24- כל־יצאי שער עירו $26a^{a}$, 27b 30- בכנעני ובפרזי		2b, 3, 5 7*, 11, 12 19, $25a^{b}$ $27b^{b}$, 29b 30-31		1, 2a 4, 6 ובני... 7-באר 8-10 13-18a 20- $25a^{a}$,b $27ab^{a}$ 28-29a	18b	1-3* 5, 7 11-13* 14* 19		4, 6 8-10* ואת־חמור 13-אביו, וידברו 13-...אחתם $15ab^{a}$ 16-18a, 20* 21-22a 23*, 24* 25b* 27-29a (E?)		ארץ כה 15b ו עירם 2 עירו עירו בנו
35	21-22a	1-5, 6b 7-8 14* 16-20	$6a^{a}$ 9-13a 15 22b-29*		$6a^{b}$ 13b 14- במקום ... אתו 27- הוא חברון		5a, 6b 14b 21-22a	1-4, 7 8, 14a 16-20	6a, 11-13a 15,5b 9-10,27-29 22b-26	13b	5 21-22a		1-4 6b-8 14 16-20	6a 9-13 15 22b-29	.. אתו לחם
36			1-8* 40-43*	(Jr) 9-11 12b-15 16*, 17-19* 20-21a* 22-39*	1- הוא אדום 8- עשו הוא אדום 12a, 16- אלוף קרח 16- אלוף עמלק 19- הוא אדום 21- ודשון, 20- וענה 21b, 25- בת־ענה 43- הוא ... אדום	8a 10-14 20-28 31-39			1-7, 9 15-19 29-30 40-43	8b		LJE 2b-3 10-11 12b-15 16* 17-19* 20-39		6-9 40-43*	1- 4- 1 ח לק ם אדום

APPENDIX D--Continued

	EISSFELDT				SIMPSON						
	J	E	P	Redactional	J^1	J^2	E	P	R	Glosses	Ch
*		4, 6 8-10* ואת־חמור אביו,וידברו -13 אחתם...-13 $15ab^{a}$ 16-18a, 20* 21-22a 23*, 24* 25b* 27-29a (E?)	–	נשיא הארץ -2 טמא -5 והאחזו בה -10 טמא -13 אליהם -14 $15b^{b}$, 18b ושכם בנו -20 אל ... עירם -20 22b וקנינם -23 ואל ... עירו -24 כל ... עירו -24 כל־בשר -25 ואת ... בנו -26	2b* $3ab^{b}$ 5*, 7a* 11-14* 19a 25a* 26*	ויענה -2 ויחר מאד... -7 $7b^{a}$ 30-31		(all P2) 1, 2a $3b^{a*}$, 4 6 8b-10 15-18a 20-24	הנער -3 כי.בתו -5 ובני.באו -7 8a, שכם -11 אל־..ו -11 שכם -13 ואת.אבי -13 13b, אליהם -14 במרמה -14 18b,19b שכם בנו -20 ואל־.בם -24 25b, בהיותם כאבים -25 שכם,ואת -26 חמורבנו -26 27,28,29a	$7b^{b}$ ומתן -12 שני־בני־יעקב -25 29b בכנעני ובפרזי -30	34
2a		1-4 6b-8 14 16-20	6a 9-13 15 22b-29	עוד -9 במקום ... אתו -14 הוא בית לחם -19	21-22a	17b	1-5, 6b-7 (E2)-14 16 18-20*	$6a^{a}$ 9-13 15 22b-29	$6a^{b}$, 8 במקום אתו..-14a 14b, 17a כי מתה -18	13b מצבה אבן -14 הוא בית לחם -19	35
	LJE 2b-3 10-11 12b-15 16* 17-19* 20-39		6-9 40-43*	1-2a 4-5 12a אלוף קרח -16 אלוף עמלק -16 הוא אדום -19 הוא ... אדום -43		10 (indep. sources) 11-14 15-19 20-30a 31-39		6 7, 8a $9a^{a}$ $40-43b^{a}$	1-5 30b	8b $9a^{b}b$ $43b^{b}$	36

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Monographs

Allgeier, Arthur. *Über Doppelberichte in der Genesis*. Freiburger Theologische Studien III. Freiburg: Herder, 1911.

Alt, A. *Der Gott der Väter*. *BWANT*. Folge III, Heft 12 (1929).

Anderson, George W. *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*. London: Duckworth, 1959.

Bentzen, Aage. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 5th printing. 2nd ed. revised. Copenhagen: Gad, 1959.

Bleek, F. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 5th ed. revised by J. Wellhausen. Berlin: Reimer, 1886.

Budde, Karl. *Die Biblische Urgeschichte (Gen. 1-12, 5)*. Giessen: Ricker, 1883.

Cassuto, U. *The Documentary Hypothesis*. Trans. I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961.

________. *La questione della Genesi*. Pubblicazioni della R. Università degli Studi di Firenze. Facolta di Lettere e Filosofia. III Serie Vol. I. Florence, 1934.

Coppens, J. *Histoire Critique des livres de l'Ancien Testament*. 3rd ed. revised. Desclée, Bruges: de Brouwer, 1942.

Cornill, C. H. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 2nd ed. revised. Freiburg: Mohr, 1892.

Dahse, Johannes. *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage*. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1912.

Delitzsch, F. *Neuer Commentar über die Genesis*. Leipzig: Dorffling und Franke, 1887.

Dillmann, August. *Die Genesis*. Part II of *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*. Ed. A. Dillmann. 6th ed. revised. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1892.

Eerdmans, B. D. *Alttestamentliche Studien*. 4 vols. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1908-1912.

Eichrodt, W. *Die Quellen der Genesis von Neuem Untersucht*. *BZAW*. XXXI (1916).

Eising, Hermann. *Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Jakoberzählung der Genesis*. Emsdetten: Lechte, 1940.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *Die ältesten Traditionen Israels*. *BZAW*. LXXI (1950).

________. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. 3rd ed. revised. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.

________. *Die Genesis der Genesis*. 2nd ed. revised. Tübingen: Mohr, 1961.

________. *Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament*. Berlin: Evang. Verlagsanstalt, 1948.

________. *Hexateuch-Synopse*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922.

Engnell, I. *Gamla Testamentet: En Traditionshistorisk Inledning*. I. Uppsala: Almquist and Wiksells, 1945.

________, and Fridrichsen, A. (eds.). *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*. 2 vols. Gävle: Skolförlaget, 1948-1950.

Fascher, Erich. *Die Formgeschichtliche Methode*. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1924.

Galling, Kurt. *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels*. *BZAW*. XLVIII (1928).

Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript*. Trans. by Eric J. Sharpe. Uppsala: Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis XXII, 1961.

Gottwald, N. K. *A Light to the Nations: An Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis*. Part I, Vol. 1 of *Göttinger Handkommentar sum Alten Testament*. Ed. by W. Nowack. 5th ed. revised. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1922.

Hahn, H. F. *Old Testament in Modern Research*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1954.

Heinisch, P. *Genesis. Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*. Ed. by F. Feldmann and H. Herkenne. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1930.

Hempel, Johannes. *Die althebräische Literatur und ihr hellenistisch-jüdisches Nachleben*. Wildpark-Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1930.

Hershon, P. I. *A Rabbinical Commentary on Genesis*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1885.

Hoftijzer, J. Die Verheissungen und die drei Erzväter. Leiden: Brill, 1956.

Hölscher, G. Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung. No. 3. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1941-1942.

________. Geschichtsschreibung in Israel. Untersuchungen zum Jahvisten und Elohisten. Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund L (1952).

Holt, J. M. The Patriarchs of Israel. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1964.

Hooke, Samuel Henry. In the Beginning. The Clarendon Bible, Old Testament Vol. VI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947.

Jacob, B. Das erste Buch der Tora--Genesis. Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1934.

Klostermann, A. Der Pentateuch. Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte. Leipzig: Deichert, 1907.

König, Eduard. Die Genesis, eingeleitet, übersetzt und erklärt. 2nd and 3rd eds. revised. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1925.

Kraeling, E. G. The Old Testament Since the Reformation. New York: Harper and Bros., 1955.

Kraus, H. J. Geschichte der historisch kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments. Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins Neukirchen Kreis Moers, 1956.

Kuenen, A. An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch. Trans. by P. H. Wicksteed. London: Macmillan, 1886.

Lewy, I. The Growth of the Pentateuch. New York: Bookman Associates, 1955.

Lods, A. Histoire de la littérature hébraique et juive. Paris: Payot, 1950.

Löhr, Max. Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem: I. Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis. BZAW. XXXVIII (1924).

MacDonald, D. B. The Hebrew Literary Genius. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933.

Martin, W. J. Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the Pentateuch. London: The Tyndale Press, 1955.

Meinhold, Johannes. Einführung in das Alte Testament. 3rd ed. revised. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1932.

________. *I. Mose 14*. *BZAW*. XXII (1911).

Meyer, E., and Luther, B. *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1906.

Mowinckel, S. *Tetrateuch-Pentateuch-Hexateuch*. *BZAW*. XC (1964).

________. *The Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen 1-11*. Oslo: Dybwad, 1937.

Napier, B. D. *From Faith to Faith*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1955.

Nielsen, Eduard. *Oral Tradition*. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 11. London: SCM Press, 1954.

________. *Shechem: A Traditio-Historical Investigation*. 2nd ed. revised. Copenhagen: Gad, 1959.

Nöldeke, Theodor. *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments*. Kiel: Schwers'sche Buchhandlung, 1869.

Noth, Martin. *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948.

________. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1957.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York and London: Harper and Bros., 1941.

Procksch, O. *Die Genesis*. Vol. I of *Kommentar Zum Alten Testament*. Ed. by E. Sellin. 3rd ed. revised. Leipzig: Deichert, 1924.

von Rad, G. *Das erste Buch Mose: Genesis*. *ATD*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1961.

________. *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch*. *BWANT*. Folge IV, Heft 26. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938.

________. *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch literarisch untersucht und theologisch gewertet*. *BWANT*. Folge IV, Heft 13. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.

Rudolph, W. *Der 'Elohist' von Exodus bis Josua*. *BZAW*. LXVIII (1938).

Schmidt, Hans (ed.). *EUCHARISTERION*. *FRLANT*. N. F. XIX. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1923.

Simons, J. *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1959.

Simpson, C. A. *Composition of the Book of Judges*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.

_______. The Early Traditions of Israel. Oxford: Blackwell, 1948.

Sievers, E. Metrische Studien. Leipzig: Taubner, Pt. I--1901, Pt. II--1904.

Skinner, John. The Divine Names in Genesis. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.

_______. Genesis. ICC. 2nd ed. revised. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1930.

Smend, R. Die Erzählung des Hexateuchs auf ihre Quellen untersucht. Berlin: Reimer, 1912.

Speiser, E. A. The Anchor Bible. Genesis. Translated with an introduction and notes. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1964.

Staerk, Willy. Studien zur Religions-und Sprachgeschichte des alten Testaments. 2 vols. Berlin: Reimer, 1899.

Steinmann, Jean. Les plus anciennes traditions du Pentateuque. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1954.

Tuch, J. C. F. Kommentar über die Genesis. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1838. Commentar über die Genesis. 2nd ed. revised by A. Arnold. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1871.

Volz, P., and Rudolph, W. Der Elohist als Erzähler: Ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik? BZAW. LXIII (1933).

Weiser, Artur. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. 5th ed. revised. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963.

Wellhausen, J. Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments. Berlin: Reimer, 1889.

Wiener, Harold M. Pentateuchal Studies. Oberlin: Bibliotheca Sacra Co., 1912.

Young, Edward J. An Introduction to the Old Testament. 2nd ed. revised. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.

Zimmerli, Walther. Geschichte und Tradition von Beerseba im alten Testament. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag von Robert Noske in Borna-Leipzig, 1932.

Articles and Periodicals

Ackroyd, Peter R. "Hosea and Jacob," VT, XIII (1963), 245-259.

Albright, W. F. "Abram the Hebrew: A New Archaeological Interpretation," BASOR, 163 (1961), 36-54.

Alonso-Schökel, L. "Erzählkunst im Buche der Richter," Biblica, XLII (1961), 143-172.

Anderson, G. W. "Some Aspects of the Uppsala School of Old Testament Study," Harvard Theological Review, XLIII (1950), 239-256.

Andrews, D. K. "Yahweh the God of the Heavens," The Seed of Wisdom. Ed. by W. S. McCullough. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964, 45-57.

Ap-Thomas, D. R. "Pentateuchal Criticism; Some Recent Trends," ET, LXIII (1950), 67-71.

Auerbach, Elias. "Die grosse Überarbeitung der biblischen Bücher," VT, Supp. I (1953), 1-10.

Baumgartner, W. "Alttestamentliche Einleitung und Literaturgeschichte," TR, N. F. VIII (1936), 179-222.

________. "Ein Kapitel vom hebräischen Erzählungsstil," EUCHARISTERION. FRLANT. N. F. XIX. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1923, I, 145-157.

________. "Wellhausen und der heutige Stand der alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," TR, N. F. II (1930), 287-307.

________. "Zum 100. Geburtstag von Hermann Gunkel," VT, Supp. IX (1963), 1-18.

Bea, A. "Der heutige Stand der Pentateuchfrage," Biblica, XVI (1935), 175-200.

Bentzen, Aage. "Bemerkungen über neuere Entwicklungen in der Pentateuchfrage," Archiv Orientální, XIX (1951), 226-232.

de Boer, P. "Genesis xxxii 23-33, Some Remarks on Composition and Character of the Story," Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift, II (1947), 149-163.

Bredenkamp, C. J. "Zu Gen. 20, 17. 18," Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben, III (1882), 671-672.

Bright, John. "Modern Study of Old Testament Literature," The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Ed. by G. E. Wright. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961, 13-31.

Bruston, C. "Les deux Jéhovistes," Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, XVIII (1885), 5-34, 499-528, 602-637.

Cazelles, H. "Connexions et structure de Gen. XV," RB, LXIX (1962), 321-349.

________. "Der Gott der Patriarchen," *Bibel und Leben*, II (1961), 39-49.

________. "A propos du Pentateuque," *Biblica*, XXXV (1954), 279-298.

Cornelius, F. "Genesis XIV," *ZAW*, LXXII (1960), 1-7.

Cross, F. M. "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *The Harvard Theological Review*, LV (1962), 225-259.

Culley, R. C. "An Approach to the Problem of Oral Tradition," *VT*, XIII (1963), 113-125.

Daube, D., and Yaron, R. "Jacob's Reception by Laban," *JSS*, I (1956), 60-62.

Del Medico, H. E. "Melchisédech," *ZAW*, LXIX (1957), 160-170.

Donner, Herbert. "Zu Gen. 28:22," *ZAW*, LXXIV (1962), 68-70.

Dornseiff, F. "Antikes zum Alten Testament: 1. Genesis," *ZAW*, LII (1934), 57-75.

________. "Die Verfasser des Pentateuch," *Altertum*, V (1959), 205-213.

Eissfeldt, O. "Non dimittam te, nisi benedixeris mihi [on Gen. 32: 23-33]," *Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert*. Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1957, 77-81.

________. "El and Yahweh," *JSS*, I (1956), 25-37.

________. "Jahwe, der Gott der Väter," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXXVIII (1963), 481-490.

________. "Jakobs Begegnung mit El und Moses Begegnung mit Jahwe," *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, LVIII (1963), 325-331.

________. "Die literarkritische Arbeit am Alten Testament in den letzten 12 Jahren," *TR*, N. F. X (1938), 255-291.

________. "Die neueste Phase in der Entwicklung der Pentateuchkritik," *TR*, N. F. XVIII (1950), 91-112, 179-215, 267-287.

Engnell, I. "Methodological Aspects of Old Testament Study," *VT*, Supp. VII (1960), 13-30.

Fohrer, Georg. "Tradition und Interpretation im Alten Testament," *ZAW*, LXXIII (1961), 1-30.

Freedman, D. N. "The Law and the Prophets," *VT*, Supp. IX (1963), 250-265.

________. "Pentateuch," *IDB*, III. New York and Nashville: Abingdon, 1962, 723-727.

Fripp, Edgar I. "Note on Genesis XVIII. XIX," *ZAW*, XII (1892), 23-29.

Gordon, C. H. "Abraham and the Merchants of Ura," *JNES*, XVII (1958), 28-31.

________. "The Patriarchal Age," *JBR*, XXI (1953), 238-243.

Gressmann, Hugo. "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen," *ZAW*, XXX (1910), 1-34.

Haran, Menahem. "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch," *JBL*, LXXXI (1962), 14-24.

Hempel, J. "Glaube, Mythos und Geschichte im Alten Testament," *ZAW*, LXV (1953), 109-167.

Hertzberg, H. W. "Die Nachgeschichte alttestamentlicher Texte innerhalb des Alten Testaments," *BZAW*, LXVI (1936), 110-121.

Humbert, Paul. "Die literarische Zweiheit des Priester-Codex in der Genesis," *ZAW*, LVIII (1940-41), 30-57.

________. "Die neuere Genesis-Forschung," *TR*, N. F. VI (1934), 147-160, 207-228.

Hyatt, J. P. "Yahweh as 'The God of my Father'," *VT*, V (1955), 130-136.

Jepsen, Alfred. "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Vätergestalten," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig*, Gesellschafts-und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, Heft 2/3, III (1953-54), 265-281.

Kaiser, O. "Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Genesis 15," *ZAW*, LXX (1958), 107-126.

Keller, Carl A. "Grundsätzliches zur Auslegung der Abraham-Uberlieferung in der Genesis," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XII (1956), 425-445.

Kessler, Martin. "The 'Shield' of Abraham," *VT*, XIV (1964), 494-497.

Koch, Klaus. "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel," *ZAW*, LXVII (1955), 205-226.

Kraetzschmar, Richard. "Der Mythus von Sodoms Ende," *ZAW*, XVII (1897), 81-92.

Lack, Rémi. "Les origines de Elyon, le Trés-Haut, dans le tradition cultuelle d'Israël," *CBQ*, XXIV (1962), 44-64.

Lehming, S. "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Gen 34," *ZAW*, LXX (1958), 228-250.

Lods, A. "La caverne de Lot," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, XCV (1927), 204-219.

Maag, V. "Jakob-Esau-Edom," Theologische Zeitschrift, XIII (1957), 418-429.

May, H. G. "The God of My Father--A Study of Patriarchal Religion," JBR, IX (1941), 155-158, 200.

________. "The Patriarchal Idea of God," JBL, LX (1941), 113-128.

McCarthy, D. J. "Three Covenants in Genesis," CBQ, XXVI (1964), 179-189.

McKenzie, J. L. "Jacob at Peniel: Gn 32:24-32," CBQ, XXV (1963), 71-76.

Meinhold, J. "Die jahwistischen Berichte in Gen 12-50," ZAW, XXXIX (1921), 42-57.

Möhlenbrink, Kurt. "Die levitischen Überlieferungen des Alten Testaments," ZAW, LII (1934), 184-231.

Morgenstern, J. "The Oldest Document of the Hexateuch," HUCA, IV (1927), 1-138.

Moritz, B. "Die Könige von Edom," Muséon, L (1937), 101-122.

________. "Ergänzungen," ZAW, LVII (1939), 148-150.

Mowinckel, S. "Erwägungen zur Pentateuchquellenfrage," Norsk theologisk tidsskrift (1964), 1-138.

________. "Hat es ein israelitisches Nationalepos gegeben?" ZAW, LIII (1935), 130-152.

________. "'Rahelstämme' und 'Leastämme'," BZAW, LXXVII (1959), 129-150.

________. "Der Ursprung der Bil'amsage," ZAW, XLVIII (1930), 233-271.

Muilenburg, J. "Old Testament Scholarship: Fifty Years in Retrospect," JBR, XXVIII (1960), 173-181.

________. "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," VT, Supp. I (1953), 97-111.

Murtonen, A. "The Fixation in Writing of Various Parts of the Pentateuch," VT, III (1953), 46-53.

North, C. R. "Pentateuchal Criticism," The Old Testament and Modern Study. Ed. by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951, 48-83.

Nyberg, H. S. "Studien zum Religionskampf im Alten Testament," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, XXXV (1938), 329-387.

Olshausen, J. "Beiträge zur Kritik des überlieferten Textes im Buche Genesis," Monatsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (June, 1870), 380-409.

Osswald, Eva. "Beobachtungen zur Erzählung von Abrahams Aufenthalt in Ägypten im 'Genesis-Apokryphon'," *ZAW*, LXXII (1960), 7-25.

Pedersen, J. "Die Auffassung vom Alten Testament," *ZAW*, XLIX (1931), 161-181.

________. "Passahfest und Passahlegende," *ZAW*, LII (1934), 161-175.

Pfeiffer, R. H. "A Non-Israelite Source of the Book of Genesis," *ZAW*, XLVIII (1930), 66-73.

Rist, M. "The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: A Liturgical and Magical Formula," *JBL*, LVII (1938), 289-303.

Rost, L. "Zum geschichtlichen Ort der Pentateuchquellen," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LIII (1956), 1-10.

________. "Die Gottesverehrung der Patriarchen im Lichte der Pentateuchquellen," *VT*, Supp. VII (1960), 346-359.

Rowley, H. H. "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age," *BJRL*, XXXII (1949), 3-38.

Rylaarsdam, J. C. "The Present Status of Pentateuchal Criticism," *JBR*, XXII (1954), 242-247.

Sandmel, Samuel. "The Haggada within Scripture," *JBL*, LXXX (1961), 105-122.

Saydon, P. P. "Recent Developments in Old Testament Literary Criticism," *Melita Theologica*, II (1949-1950), 79-96.

Schildenberger, J. "Jakobs nächtlicher Kampf mit dem Elohim am Jabok (Gn 32, 23-33)," *Miscellanea Biblica B. Ubach*. Montserrat: n.p.; printer--Imprenta-Escuela, Barcelona, 1953, 69-96.

Schmid, H. "Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem," *ZAW*, LXVII (1955), 168-197.

Schmökel, Hartmut. "Zur Datierung der Pentateuchquelle J," *ZAW*, LXII (1949-1950), 319-321.

Schulz, Alfons. "Eli'ezer?" *ZAW*, LII (1934), 274-279.

Seale, M. S. "The Glosses in the Book of Genesis and the J-E-Theory: An Attempt at a New Solution," *ET*, LXVII (1956), 333-335.

Seebass, H. "Zu Genesis 15," *Wort und Dienst*, N. F. VII (1963), 132-149.

________. "GEN 15 2b," *ZAW*, LXXV (1963), 317-319.

Seeligmann, I. L. "Hebräische Erzählung und biblische Geschichtsschreibung," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, XVIII (1962), 305-325.

Segal, M. H. "The Composition of the Pentateuch--A Fresh Examination," *Scripta Hierosolymitana*. Ed. by C. Rabin. VIII. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1961, 68-114.

________. "El, Elohim and YHWH in the Bible," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XLVI (1955-1956), 89-115.

Segert, S. "Zur Methode der alttestamentlichen Literarkritik," *Archiv Orientální*, XXIV (1956), 610-621.

Shreiner, J. "Segen für die Volker in der Verheissung an die Väter," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, N. F. VI (1962), 1-31.

Snijders, L. A. "Genesis XV. The Covenant with Abram," *Oudtestamentische Studien*, XII (1958), 261-279.

Speiser, E. A. "The Verb *sḥr* in Genesis and Early Hebrew Movements," *BASOR*, 164 (1961), 23-28.

________. "The Wife-Sister Motif in the Patriarchal Narratives," *Biblical and Other Studies*. Ed. by Alexander Altmann. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963, 15-28.

Staerk, W. "Zur alttestamentlichen Literarkritik," *ZAW*, XLII (1924), 34-74.

Steele, J. "The Patriarchal Narratives," *ET*, XLV (1933-1934), 523-524.

Stoebe, H. "Grenzen der Literarkritik im Alten Testament," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, LVIII (1962), 385-400.

Thomas, D. Winton. "The Sixth Century B.C.: A Creative Epoch in the History of Israel," *JSS*, VI (1961), 33-46.

van Trigt, F. "La signification de la lutte de Jacob près du Yabboq, Genèse xxxii 23-33," *Oudtestamentische Studien*, XII (1958), 280-309.

della Vida, L. "El 'Elyôn in Genesis 14:18-20," *JBL*, LXIII (1944), 1-9.

deVaux, R. "Les patriarches hébreux et les découvertes modernes," *RB*, LIII (1946), 321-348; LV (1948), 321-347; LVI (1949), 5-36.

________. "Les patriarches hébreux et l'histoire," *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus*, XIII (1962-1963), 287-297.

________. "A propos du second centenaire d'Astruc--réflexions sur l'état actuel de la critique du Pentateuque," *VT*, Supp. I (1953), 186.

Waterman, L. "Jacob the Forgotten Supplanter," *AJSL*, LIV (1938), 25-43.

Weinfeld, M. "Universalism and Particularism in the Period of Exile and Restoration," *Tarbiz*, XXXIII (1963/64), 228-242.

Winnett, F. V. "Re-examining the Foundations," JBL, LXXXIV (1965), 1-19.

Wright, G. E. "Issues in Biblical Studies: History and the Patriarchs," ET, LXXI (1959-60), 292-296.

Yeivin, S. "The Age of the Patriarchs," Revista degli Studi Orientali, XXXVIII (1963), 277-302.

Zimmerli, W. "Sinaibund und Abrahambund. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Priesterschrift," Theologische Zeitschrift, XVI (1960), 268-280.